

VOL. XVII. (XXXVI.)  
1879.

[THIRD SERIES.]

NO. LXVI. (CLXXX.)  
JUNE.

# THE MONTH

AND

*Catholic Review.*



LONDON:

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

BURNS AND OATES.

DUBLIN: W. H. SMITH AND SON; M. H. GILL AND SON.

GLASGOW: H. MARGEY. PARIS: A. XAVIER.

BALTIMORE: KELLY AND PIET. NEW YORK: P. O'SHEA.

NEW YORK AND MONTREAL: D. AND J. SADLIER.

---

Price Half-a-Crown.

*All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.*

**TO FOREIGN SUBSCRIBERS TO THE MONTH AND  
CATHOLIC REVIEW.**

THE Subscription to *The Month and Catholic Review* for all countries included in the Postal Union is the same as in England and Ireland, *i.e.* 30/- a year *paid in advance*. Foreign Subscribers can receive the numbers at this rate by sending their addresses and subscriptions to the Office, 48, South Street, Grosvenor Square. Cheques to be drawn upon any London Bank, and Money Orders upon the Post Office, London, payable to Mr. JOSEPH HAGUE.

---

**ST. JOSEPH'S  
CATHOLIC LENDING LIBRARY,  
48, South Street, Grosvenor Square.**

OPEN DAILY FROM HALF-PAST TEN TO FIVE O'CLOCK.

---

**T E R M S .**

**I. For Subscribers who pay in advance :**

For a Month.....	1 Vol.	at a time...	<i>Two Shillings.</i>
For One Quarter .....	3 Vols.	„	<i>..... Six Shillings.</i>
For Half a Year .....	1 Vol.	„	<i>..... Six Shillings.</i>
For Half a Year .....	3 Vols.	„	<i>... Half a Guinea.</i>
For a Year .....	1 Vol.	„	<i>... Half a Guinea.</i>
For a Year .....	3 Vols.	„	<i>..... One Guinea.</i>
„ In the Country	4 Vols.	„	<i>..... One Guinea.</i>

**II. For Families in the Country and for Book Clubs.**

For a Year .....	25 Vols.	„	<i>..... Five Guineas.</i>
------------------	----------	---	----------------------------

Special arrangements can be made for Book Clubs where recent publications are not required.

**III. For Casual Readers who pay in advance :**

Threepence—1 Vol. at a time, which may be kept a week.

**IV. For all who do not pay in advance :**

Sixpence for 1 Vol. at a time, and Postage Expenses incurred in recovering Arrears.

---

**REGISTERS FOR GOVERNESSES, AND OTHERS  
REQUIRING SITUATIONS.**

The Managers of St. Joseph's Library have also for some time opened a Register for Catholic Governesses, and are in constant communication with families seeking the services of such ladies. They also receive the names of servants wanting employment, and keep a list of vacant situations. *No fees whatever are charged, except for postage.*



1

p  
a  
4  
C  
S  
o  
b



*Now ready for delivery to Subscribers.*

---

## PIETAS MARIANA BRITANNICA.

A HISTORY OF ENGLISH DEVOTION TO THE MOST BLESSED  
VIRGIN MARYE MOTHER OF GOD,

WITH A

CATALOGUE OF SHRINES, SANCTUARIES, OFFERINGS,  
BEQUESTS, AND OTHER MEMORIALS OF THE PIETY  
OF OUR FOREFATHERS.

BY

EDMUND WATERTON, F.S.A.

*Knight of the Order of Christ, of Rome.*

---

*Only a small Edition of this beautiful Work has been printed. The subscription price is Fifteen Shillings. Subscribers are requested to apply for copies at St. Joseph's Catholic Library, 48, South Street, Grosvenor Square, London, W. Post Office Orders are to be made payable to F. Gordon, at the South Audley Street Office. The Subscription List will be closed at the end of June, after which the price of the remaining copies will be raised.*

---

LONDON:

ST. JOSEPH'S CATHOLIC LIBRARY,

48, SOUTH STREET, GROSVENOR SQUARE, W.

## CONTENTS.

## BOOK THE FIRST.

*History of English Devotion to our Ladye.*

## PART THE FIRST.

## OUR LADYE AND HER LIEGEMEN.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Chapter the First. England the Dower of Marye. | Chapter the Fourth. Universal Homage.        |
| Chapter the Second. Our Blessed Ladye's Name.  | Section 1. Kings.                            |
| Chapter the Third. First Fruits.               | Section 2. Knights and Orders of Knighthood. |
| Section 1. Childhood and Boyhood.              | Section 3. Shipmen.                          |
| Section 2. Oxford and Cambridge.               | Section 4. Serjeants-at-Law.                 |
|  | Section 5. Authors and Printers.             |
|  | Section 6. Innholders                        |

## PART THE SECOND.

## FORMS OF HOMAGE.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Chapter the First. Shrines.                                    | Immaculate Conception. Anthems.               |
| Section 1. Churches. Organs and Bells.                         | Saturdays.                                    |
| Wax Images.  | Section 4. The Angelus.                       |
| Section 2. Ladye Chapels. Loreto Chapels. Other Ladye Chapels. | Section 5. The Beads.                         |
| Section 3. Ladye Altars. Inscriptions.                         | Section 6. Our Blessed Ladye's Litanies.      |
| Candles. Relics.   | Section 7. Other Devotions.                   |
| Chapter the Second. Associations.                              | Section 8. Comparison of Old and New.         |
| Section 1. Gilds.  | Chapter the Fourth. Things Consecrated.       |
| Section 2. The Sodality.                                       | Section 1. Cities and Municipal Corporations. |
| Chapter the Third. Devotions and Good Works.                   | Section 2. Land.                              |
| Section 1. Pilgrimages. Processions.                           | Section 3. Ladye Wells.                       |
| Alms. Fasting.   | Section 4. Flowers.                           |
| Section 2. The Marye Mass.                                     | Section 5. Household Furniture.               |
| Section 3. Office. Little Office of the                        | Section 6. Details of Common Life.            |
|  | Section 7. Death and Burial.                  |

## PART THE THIRD.

## THE ICONOGRAPHY OF OUR BLESSED LADYE IN ENGLAND.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1. Preliminary Remarks.                         | Section 11. Colouring of Statues.                         |
| Section 2. The Immaculate Conception.                   | Section 12. Veils.  |
| Section 3. The Annunciation.                            | Section 13. Our Ladye's Feet.                             |
| Section 4. Our Ladye in Gesine.                         | Section 14. The Crowning of Statues of our Blessed Ladye. |
| Section 5. The Assumption.                              | Section 15. Birds.  |
| Section 6. Our Ladye of Pity.                           | Section 16. Opening Statues.                              |
| Section 7. Our Ladye of Grace.                          | Section 17. Relics in Statues.                            |
| Section 8. Our Ladye of Peace.                          | Section 18. Offerings to Sanctuaries of our Ladye.        |
| Section 9. Beauty of English Images of our Ladye.       | Section 19. Conclusion.                                   |
| Section 10. The Robing of Statues of our Blessed Ladye. |   |

## BOOK THE SECOND.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Catalogue of Shrines, Sanctuaries, Offerings, Bequests, &c. | Alphabetical List of Principal Places (263) mentioned in Book the Second. |
| Addenda et Corrigenenda.                                    |   |

## LONDON:

ST. JOSEPH'S CATHOLIC LIBRARY,  
48, SOUTH STREET, GROSVENOR SQUARE, W.

---

## A GRACIOUS LIFE.

BEING THE LIFE OF

BARBARA ACARIE

*Of the Reformed Order of our Blessed Lady of Mount Carmel.*

BY

EMILY BOWLES.

---

### BOOK THE FIRST.

Chapter I.—Barbara Avrillot. Chapter II.—Barbara married. Chapter III.—Looking Life in the Face. Chapter IV.—The Hotel Acarie. Chapter V.—Service at Home. Chapter VI.—Work out of doors. Chapter VII.—Friends and Guides.

### BOOK THE SECOND.

Chapter I.—Preparing the Ground. Chapter II.—Preparing the Plants. Chapter III.—Notre Dame des Champs. Chapter IV.—From France to Spain. Chapter V.—From Spain to France.

### BOOK THE THIRD.

Chapter I.—Paris and Notre Dame du Champs again. Chapter II.—The First Grafts. Chapter III.—The Spanish Prioress. Chapter IV.—“Mademoiselle Acarie,” a Novice. Chapter V.—First Swarms. Pontoise. Chapter VI.—Sister Mary. Chapter VII.—Within the Grating.—Chapter VIII.—“Until Death.”

Price 6s.

*This is the Easter Volume of the Quarterly Series.*

---

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES.

---

## THE MANNA OF THE SOUL.

MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY OF THE YEAR.

BY FATHER SEGNERI.

In Four Vols.

---

*Already published.*

VOL. I. JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH. Price 6s. 6d.

VOL. II. APRIL, MAY, JUNE. Price 7s. 6d.

*Will be ready in June.*

VOL. III. JULY, AUGUST, SEPTEMBER. Price 7s. 6d.

---

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES.

---

## THE FOURTH VOLUME OF THE PUBLIC LIFE OF OUR LORD.

(CONCLUDING THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT)

BY THE REV. H. J. COLERIDGE,

*Of the Society of Jesus.*

Price 6s. 6d.

---

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES.

## THREE CATHOLIC REFORMERS.

1. ST. VINCENT FERRER.
2. ST. BERNARDINE OF SIENA.
3. ST. JOHN CAPISTRAN.

BY MARY H. ALLIES.

Price 5s.

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES.

## THE HISTORY OF THE SACRED PASSION.

BY FATHER LUIS DE LA PALMA,

*Of the Society of Jesus.*

Translated from the Spanish. With Preface by the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J.

*New Edition. Price 7s. 6d.**Also a cheaper edition of the same, on thin paper and in black cloth, 5s.*

## THE MESSENGER OF THE SACRED HEART.

No. XXX. (CXXXVI.), VOL. XXIII. *Price Sixpence. By post, Sevenpence.**Post free for Seven Shillings a Year.*

CONTENTS FOR JUNE.—A humble life in a French city.—Armelle Nicolas. A Visit to the Blessed Sacrament. An Account of certain conferences betwixt a Provincial of the Jesuits and a certain young man of the Order of St. Antony, A.D. 1631. The Missions of Peking and Petcheli (continued). From the Chronicles of St. Francis (The Blessed Eustochiæ of the Order of St. Clare. The Blessed Cherubino of Spoletti.) Verses for the Stations of the Cross. Some Chapters on Charity (Chapter XIII. Of Christ's union, through the Blessed Sacrament, with the soul, and the fresh proof which this gives to us of His love. Chapter XIV. The love which Christ manifested in His sermon after the Last Supper. Chapter XV. Of the love which Christ manifested in His Passion, and which He signified in the thirst, caused by His desire to save us and to suffer for us. Chapter XVI. Of the love of Christ in refusing all sensible consolation during His torments on the Cross. Intention for the Apostolate of Prayer for June—Preachers according to the Sacred Heart. The Holy League of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

ST. JOSEPH'S LIBRARY, 48, SOUTH STREET, GROSVENOR SQUARE, W.

Where Subscriptions for the current year should now be paid.

*The trade may apply to Messrs. BURNS and OATES.*

## THE IRISH MONTHLY.

*Price Sixpence.**Post free for Seven Shillings a Year.*

DUBLIN: M. H. GILL AND SON. LONDON: BURNS AND OATES.

*The Birkbeck Building Society's Annual Receipts exceed Four Millions.*

**H**OW TO PURCHASE A HOUSE FOR TWO GUINEAS PER MONTH, with Immediate Possession and no Rent to pay.—Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK BUILDING SOCIETY, 29 and 30, Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane.

**H**OW TO PURCHASE A PLOT OF LAND FOR FIVE SHILLINGS PER MONTH, with Immediate Possession, either for Building or Gardening purposes.—Apply at the Office, as above.

**H**OW TO INVEST YOUR MONEY WITH SAFETY.—Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK BANK, 29 and 30, Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane. Deposits received at varying rates of interest for stated periods, or repayable on demand. Current Accounts opened according to the usual practice of Bankers, and Interest allowed on the minimum monthly balances. English and Foreign Stocks and Shares purchased and sold, and Advances made thereon. Letters of Credit and Circular Notes issued. A Pamphlet, with full particulars, may be had on application.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

## BURNS &amp; OATES' NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*The Holy Gospel of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, according to St. John.  
With a Preface by Cardinal MANNING. 1s.

*Just Published, One Vol. Royal 8vo, cloth, price 10s. 6d.*

*Father Henry Walpole the Martyr.* The Life of this saintly Jesuit is contained in *One Generation of a Norfolk House*: a Contribution to Elizabethan History. By AUGUSTUS JESSOPP, D.D., Head Master of King Edward VI.'s School, Norwich.

CONTENTS.—1. Introduction. 2. The Walpoles of Houghton. 3. School and College Days. 4. The Excommunication and its Results. 5. The Jesuit Mission to England. 6. The Kinsmen. 7. John Gerard. 8. The Missio Castrensis. 9. The Return to England. 10. Father Gerard's "Much Good." 11. Capture and Imprisonment. 12. The Tower and the Rack. 13. The Trial and the Scaffold. 14. The Gathering of the Fragments.

*Just out, price 2s.*

*Spiritual Reading for Every Day*: an Introduction to the Interior and Perfect Life, for the use alike of persons in the world and in religion. Arranged in Fifty-three Lessons, made up from Holy Scriptures, the Devout Life, and the Imitation of Christ, by Rev. Dom. INNOCENT LA MASSON, Forty-ninth General of the Order of Carthusians, 1677. Translated and slightly abridged by KENELM DIGBY BESTE, Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. *Suitable for all readers, young and old.*

*The Lives of the Cardinals.* By PATRICK JUSTIN O'BYRNE. Portraits, Memoirs, and Autographs. Monthly, Half-a-Crown.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—The Part for June is devoted to the Life of the great Oratorian Father and CARDINAL, JOHN HENRY NEWMAN. It contains a full review of his connection with the Tractarian Movement, his early associates, his literary labours, his first Sermons as a Catholic priest, his life as an Oratorian, and is accompanied by a beautiful Portrait.

*Just Published, One Vol. Crown 8vo., pp. 500, price 10s. 6d.*

*Essays on Devotional and Scriptural Subjects.* Reprinted from the *Dublin Review*. By WM. GEORGE WARD, D.Ph.

CONTENTS.—1. Catholic Devotion to our Blessed Lady. 2. Catholic Doctrine concerning our Blessed Lady. 3. Mary and the Gospels. 4. The Sacred Heart. 5. St. Paul's relations with St. Peter. 6. St. Mary Magdalen in the Gospels. 7. Father Coleridge on the Gospels. 8. Gospel Narrative of the Resurrection. 9. Father Coleridge's *Life of our Life*.

*Now Ready, Vol. III. (completing the work), price 6s.*

*The Christian Life and Virtues considered in the Religious State.*

By Mgr. CHARLES GAY, Coadjutor to the Bishop of Poitiers. Translated from the French by the Rt. Rev. Abbot BURDER, Order of the Reformed Cistercians. Vol. I. and II., 6s. each.

*Cambria Sacra; or the History of the Early Cambro-British Christians.* By the Rev. LOUIS NEDELEC. One Vol. 8vo, xxx, 584 pp. 10s. 6d.

*Three Lectures on Anglican Orders.* By Father GALLWEY, S.J. 2s.

*The Workings of the Divine Will*: Gleanings from PÈRE CAUSSADE, S.J. Translated from the French by a Father of the Society of Jesus. 9d.

*Novena in honour of St. Catharine of Sienna.* Compiled on the same plan as "The Miniature Lives." Price 2d. each.

BURNS & OATES, PORTMAN STREET AND PATERNOSTER ROW.

PAX.

## *S. Benedict's College and Monastery,* FORT AUGUSTUS, INVERNESS.

1. This College, opened October 16th, 1878, is conducted by the Fathers of the *English Benedictine* Congregation, and is now in full working order.

2. It is designed to provide for the *sons of gentlemen* a liberal education, and to combine the refining influences of home life with the manly and invigorating spirit of a public school.

3. Besides the usual Collegiate Course in Classics and Science, students in the higher classes will receive instruction in Land Surveying, Geology, Agricultural Chemistry, Domestic Architecture, the Elementary Laws of Contracts and Property, and in such branches as will be found of practical usefulness in after life to the sons of Landed Proprietors and Professional Men.

4. Care has been taken to incorporate into the buildings the *latest improvements*. The students are provided with the best and most recent books, maps, and educational apparatus.

5. *Drawing* is taught to the whole College as a part of the *ordinary course*.

6. With a view to meeting the rationalism of the age, special care is taken not only to instil into students a spirit of piety, but also to ground them in the *Reasons of the Faith*. A graduated course of religious instruction is therefore given proportionate to the age and capacity of the student.

7. To promote health every student is required, unless otherwise advised by his doctor, to take a *sponge bath every morning*. The cubicles of the dormitories are unusually large, carpeted, furnished with wardrobe, chairs, lavatory, bath, and heated with hot water pipes.

8. A report of the *conduct and progress in study* of each student is sent to Parents at Midsummer and Christmas. A *certificate of Health*, drawn up and signed by the local Visiting Physician, will accompany these reports.

9. No boy is allowed to *boat* who has not acquired the necessary proficiency in *swimming*.

10. The College is situated at the head of Loch Ness, in the midst of the grandest highland scenery. The *pure mountain air* and the singular mildness of the climate render the locality exceptionally healthy.

11. An experienced *matron* superintends the linen department, and looks to the wants of the smaller boys.

12. The students rise at six in summer and at half-past six in winter.

13. The College is divided into the Preparatory School, the Intermediate School, and the High School.

14. Students will be admitted into the Preparatory School at nine years of age.

15. Preparatory School, 70 guineas; Intermediate School, 80 Guineas; High School, 90 Guineas.

16. For further particulars and prospectus apply to the Very Rev. Prior Vaughan, O.S.B. Address as above.

N.B. Boys can take Through Tickets from Bristol, Birmingham, London, Liverpool, York, to Inverness, changing carriages only at Perth. From London to Edinburgh in nine hours, Edinburgh to Perth two hours. The Highland Express, leaving Perth at 9.30 a.m., reaches Inverness at 2.45. The mail steamer leaves Inverness at 3.30, plies along the Caledonian Canal, and out into the beautiful waters of Loch Ness (the Lucerne of Scotland), and arrives at the College Pier at 7 p.m.



SOLD FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE NEW MONASTERY BUILDINGS AT FORT AUGUSTUS, THE COLLEGE BUILDINGS BEING ALREADY COMPLETED.

### *The Church a Light unto the Nations.*

A Sermon preached at the opening of St. Benedict's College, Fort Augustus,

By VERY REV. J. N. SWEENEY, O.S.B.

Comprising also a description of the buildings and programme of the College, and speeches at the inaugural dinner by Prior Vaughan, Right Rev. Bishop Macdonald of Aberdeen, the Right Rev. F. Abbot Burchall, and the Right Hon. Lord Lovat.

Price 1s.

---

### *The Life of Abbot Bloisius ;*

OR, A BENEDICTINE OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

By GEORGES DE BLOIS.

TRANSLATED BY LADY LOVAT.

Price 6s. 6d.

---

### *The Spiritual Conflict and Conquest.*

Edited, with Preface and Notes, by PRIOR VAUGHAN, O.S.B.,

*With Frontispiece, handsomely bound, Second Edition.*

Price 8s. 6d., reprinting.

---

### *Pax Animæ.*

By S. PETER ALCANTARA.

Also,

*A Treatise of the Virtues and Vows of Religious Persons.*

Second Edition, Edited by PRIOR VAUGHAN, O.S.B.

Price 1s.

---

### *Life of S. Thomas of Aquin.*

By ARCHBISHOP VAUGHAN, O.S.B.

Popular Edition. Edited, with Preface, by PRIOR VAUGHAN, O.S.B.

Price 8s. 6d.

---

BURNS AND OATES, LONDON.

## MONTH AND CATHOLIC REVIEW.

### CONTENTS FOR JUNE, 1879.

#### ARTICLES, &c. :—

1. Liberalism and Liberalism.
2. The Native Tribes of North America and the Catholic Missions (V. Algonquin Tribes. Missions among the Abnakis, Micmacs, and Etchemins). *By the Rev. A. J. Thibaud.*
3. Gleanings among old Records. VII. Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, and Claude Nau (continued). *By the Rev. Joseph Stevenson.*
4. The Netherlands from 1555 to 1567. *By Wilfred C. Robinson.*
5. Anemone.  
Chapter XXXI.—October at Flaxhead.  
XXXII.—The Parlour of the Six-Cross Inn.  
" XXXIII.—"Le mie prigionieri."
6. New Solutions of Homeric Problems (II. The Age of the Poems. Part the First). *By H. W. Lucas.*
7. Some Notes on the Assyrian and Babylonian Gods. *By the Rev. J. N. Strassmaier.*
8. Mr. Gladstone on Probabilism. *By the Rev. H. J. Coleridge.*

#### CATHOLIC REVIEW.

##### I.—Notes on the Press.

1. Cardinal Newman and Dr. Döllinger.
2. The Bible and Assyriology. *By Rev. M. F. Vigouroux.* From the *Revue des Questions Historiques.*

##### II.—Reviews and Notices.

William Cobbett; One Generation of a Norfolk House, a contribution to Elizabethan History; Cambria Sacra; Pietas Mariana Britannica; Freedom of Education and Teaching; The M'Phersons; Bellevue and its Owner; Record of a Girlhood; The Ruddy Harper.

*\*\* Vol. XVI. is now ready. Cases for Binding can be had at the Publishers.*

All Advertisements to be sent to Messrs. BURNS and OATES, 17 Portman Street, W.

### JOHN HARDMAN AND COMPANY, BIRMINGHAM,

**Metal Workers in Silver, Brass, and Wrought Iron,  
GAS FITTERS,**

**ENGRAVERS OF MEMORIAL BRASSES,**

**Artists in Stained Glass and Mural Decorators,**

*Medallists, &c.*

MESSRS. J. HARDMAN AND CO. having lately rebuilt their Show Rooms in London, and made considerable improvements and additions to them, have now a much larger stock of Art Metal Work on view, of which they respectfully invite an inspection from Architects and all who are interested in Ecclesiastical Art.

LONDON ADDRESS:

**13, KING WILLIAM STREET, STRAND, W.C.**

AGENTS:

**BURNS AND OATES, 17, PORTMAN STREET, W.**



## *Liberalism and Liberalism.*

---

"WHO is this," we read in the Book of Job, "who is this that wrappeth up sentences in unskilful words?"<sup>1</sup> The Anglican version is a little different, and as the Septuagint, again, is not the same as the Vulgate, we may suppose that the original is not altogether free from obscurity. "Who is this," says the Anglican version, "that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" We are not about to engage in a critical discussion on the relative excellence of the various versions of this famous text. It is enough for our purpose that its truth must frequently rise to the mind in the present day, when words are so often used out of their proper sense, and when considerable capital is sometimes made of the misuse of a common word. M. de Champagny some years ago wrote a very telling little pamphlet, *Sur la Puissance des Mots*; and it would not be impossible to increase the array of instances which are there adduced of the influence of words used in a sense which they do not rightly bear. Our present paper has a much more limited range. We hear a good deal just now of one or two words which are certainly "unskilfully" used by certain writers—unless we are to suspect them of deliberate malice in the senses which they attach to them, of which malice there is no sufficient sign. But it happens that a great master of the English language and of English religious and philosophical thought, has lately defined the meaning of a word which he has used all his life to denote what he dislikes and disapproves, and, as is usual with him, he has defined it so clearly, as to make it seem difficult that any other meaning than the true meaning could have been attached to it, even by the most blundering and ignorant minds. Nevertheless, the account which Cardinal Newman has given of Liberalism in his short address on receiving the formal intimation of his elevation to the Cardinalate, will probably sound like a revelation to many who may

<sup>1</sup> Job xxxviii. 2.

have had their peace of mind disturbed by the very "unskilful" and unintelligent use which has been made of the word Liberalism by some at least who might have been expected to know better. And it will not be inopportune to make a few remarks on the subject, taking Cardinal Newman's definition as our text, for the sake of endeavouring, at least, to clear up some of the "darkening of counsel" which has been the result of misunderstanding or misrepresentation, especially as more than one important truth may be incidentally illustrated at the same time.

In the address to which we refer, the new English Cardinal claimed for himself the one merit of having all his life contended against the principle of Liberalism in religion.

For thirty, forty, fifty years, I have resisted to the best of my power the spirit of Liberalism in religion. Never did the Holy Church need champions against it more sorely than now, when, alas! it is an error overspreading as a snare the whole earth; and, on this great occasion, when it is natural for one who is in my place to look out upon the world and upon the Holy Church as it is and upon her future, it will not, I hope, be considered out of place if I renew the protest against it which I have so often made. Liberalism in religion is the doctrine that there is no positive truth in religion, but that one creed is as good as another, and this is the teaching which is gaining substance and force daily. It is inconsistent with the recognition of any religion as true. It teaches that all are to be tolerated, as all are matters of opinion. Revealed religion is not a truth, but a sentiment and a taste—not an objective fact, not miraculous; and it is the right of each individual to make it say just what strikes his fancy. Devotion is not necessarily founded on faith. Men may go to Protestant Churches and to Catholic, may get good from both and may belong to neither. They may fraternize together in spiritual thoughts and feelings, without having any views at all of doctrine in common or seeing the need of them. Since, then, religion is so personal a peculiarity and so private a possession, we must of necessity ignore it in the intercourse of man with man. If a man puts on a new religion every morning, what is that to you? It is as impertinent to think about a man's religion as about his management of his family. Religion is in no sense the bond of society. Hitherto the civil power has been Christian. Even in countries separated from the Church, as in my own, the *dictum* was in force when I was young that Christianity was the law of the land. Now everywhere that goodly framework of society which was the work of Christianity is throwing off Christianity. . . . Hitherto it has been considered that religion alone, with its supernatural sanctions, was strong enough to secure the submission of the mass of the population to law and order. Now, philosophers and politicians are

bent on satisfying this problem without the aid of Christianity. Instead of the Church's authority and teaching, they would substitute, first of all, a universal and a thorough secular education, calculated to bring home to every individual that to be orderly, industrious, and sober is his personal interest. Then, for great working principles to take the place of religion for the use of the masses thus carefully educated, they provide the broad, fundamental, ethical truths of justice, benevolence, veracity, and the like, proved experience, and those natural laws which exist and act spontaneously in society and social matters, whether physical or psychological—for instance, in government, trade, finance, sanitary experiments, and the intercourse of nations. As to religion, it is a private luxury, which a man may have if he will, but which, of course, he must pay for, and which he must not obtrude upon others or indulge to their annoyance.

We must not quote the whole of this address, the report of which, of course, we take as it is given in the papers, and without vouching for its perfect accuracy. It will be enough for our present purpose to remind ourselves that when he came to speak of the working of this religious "Liberalism" in England, the Cardinal of St. George gave three reasons why it should be so successful as it is. The first of these was, that the sects, which have existed in this country for so many generations, are all naturally antagonistic to the union of Church and State for the benefit of the Establishment, and so have a direct interest in working for the "un-Christianizing of the monarchy, and all that belongs to it, under the notion that such a catastrophe would make Christianity much more pure and much more powerful." The second reason given by the Cardinal lay in the necessity of the case, the members of the various sects among us making up half the population, and having, all of them, their share in political power. "How can they possibly act together in municipal or national matters, if each insists on the recognition of his own religious denomination?" The last and third reason is the most important for us. "It must be borne in mind," says the Cardinal, "that there is much in the Liberalistic theory which is good and true; for example, not to say more, the precepts of justice, truthfulness, sobriety, self-command, benevolence, which, as I have already noted, are among its avowed principles. It is not till we find that this array of principles is intended to supersede, to block out religion, that we pronounce it to be evil."

It would be very well if these clear and precise statements as to the principles of religious Liberalism, and as to the

character of the mischief at which it aims, could be made perfectly familiar to the minds of all those who talk or write about Liberalism. The word Liberalism, like its counterpart Conservatism, belongs principally, in this country, to the sphere of politics, and it adds considerably to the chances of misconception, that even political Liberalism in this country has a widely different tendency from that of the political Liberalism of the Continent. It is very clear then that unless Liberalism in politics is the same as Liberalism in religion, and the same everywhere, we are in danger of the utmost confusion of thought if we apply what is said of the one to the other. Let us leave aside for the moment, then, the sphere of religion and truth, and consider the two counter-principles of "Liberalism" and "Conservatism" in the region of politics. Here it is obvious that the two principles are matters of policy, and that it may be right or wrong, prudent or imprudent, to follow one or the other, according to circumstances. Sensible people may prefer one to the other, and may be very fervently loyal to either, but they do not go the length of considering their opponents to be bad citizens or wicked men. Liberalism, in the sense in which it is advocated as a principle by those who profess its creed, is the policy of improvement, of progress, of the extension of liberty, of the removal of supposed abuses and anomalies, privileges, class distinctions, civil disabilities, and the like. Conservatism is the principle of upholding what is ancient and what is in possession, of resisting changes, of preserving privileges and prerogative. Now it is obvious that either of these two principles may be the best for a given country or a body politic at a given time. Not all things, that are ancient or in possession are worth preserving, not all possible changes will turn out improvements. The history of the Church shows, indeed, that she has had the commission, of which Cardinal Newman speaks, of forming a society on her own lines, so to say, and that she has exercised a vast and most marvellous influence for good by her work in this direction. But it does not show that she has been of necessity always either Conservative or Liberal—rather it may truly be said, that she has always been both. It does not show that she has attached the seal of her sanction exclusively to any one form of political government. The doctrine of her best divines has been that society has, as such, and independent of its particular form, a Divine commission and power—the power of which our

Lord spoke to Pilate when it was about to be misused, and when its misuse was to aggravate the sin of His own enemies. The wisest statesmen, in all countries, have always been either Liberal or Conservative according to the requirements of time and place. Thus, men who are Liberal at one time may be Conservative at another, and what is Liberal in one sense may be Conservative in another. The principles themselves are but imperfectly embodied in the parties which call themselves by their names. The country oscillates between the two parties, more or less faithfully, according to the requirements of the time. If it wants change, it generally calls in the Liberals, as a sick man calls in the doctor. When it has had enough of change and requires rest, it turns out the party of change, as the convalescent man turns out the doctor. This, of course, is not the only reason for the changes of Government to which we are accustomed—for one set of men may be superior or inferior to another in administration, in finance, in political prudence and integrity, in regard for the honour of the country, and the like. This difference may be quite independent of the name by which their party calls itself. No one has ever been so foolish as to assert an absolute immutable contrariety as between right and wrong in matters of this kind.

What is true of parties and of principles, is also true of measures. The last English Reform Bill was the work of a Conservative Government, but it was a Liberal measure in one sense, for it opened the franchise to large constituencies, and a Conservative measure in another, if it tended to preserve the legislation against the dangers which might have arisen if no concessions had been made. To do away with the Parliamentary power of the "owners" of the nomination boroughs was a Liberal measure; to do away with the system of "protection" which enhanced the price of bread, to enlarge the Government aid given to education, as was the case last year when the Intermediate Education Bill of the Government was passed, to emancipate the slaves, to emancipate Catholics and Jews, to throw thousands of Government appointments open to competition, to abolish the property qualification for members of Parliament,—all these, and such as these, are Liberal measures, in the truest sense, but there is not the slightest reason why they should not also be called, in a higher sense, Conservative also, if they tend, in the main, to the stability and well-being of the body politic. There are no Christian countries in Europe in

which Liberal measures have not been more or less the general rule of the practical policy of the Government in the course of the present century, while in some the tide of change may have seemed to have gone too far, in others, not to have gone far enough. In Russia the "Liberalism" of the Government has reached the point of the emancipation of the serfs. In France it has gone as far as universal suffrage and the tyranny of the majority. It might be well for Russia to enter on a course of further Liberalism; it might be well for France to stop short in the course which is fast bringing back the days of the first Revolution. That is, Conservatism is as bad, for the time, in Russia, as Liberalism, in the political sense, is bad, for the time, in France.

We are thus, in the political sphere, very far indeed from the Liberalism against which the Cardinal has all his life been fighting, and when he says that he has been fighting for thirty, forty, fifty years, he means that he fought against it quite as earnestly when he was an Anglican as he has fought against it as a Catholic. The reason is obvious. In the religious sphere there is a fixed immutable standard of truth, a living law which must be obeyed, and which is altogether independent of human opinion. This is the one only reason why Liberalism in religion is wrong. The positive tenets of the Liberalism of which the Cardinal speaks are, as he says, good and true in themselves, but the system which would employ them as substitutes for the doctrines and sanctions of a supernatural religion deserves all the strong language which he applies to it. It is an apostacy from Christianity, it is a device of the enemy most cleverly framed and with great prospect of success. The very strength and truth of this language is enough to show the immensity of the mistake which would be committed if it were applied to any form of opinion outside the sphere in which different forms are forbidden on the grounds here assigned. It is just as foolish and unreasonable to turn a matter of opinion into a creed, as it is to make a creed a matter of opinion. It requires all the consideration which experience of the extreme confusion and narrowness of thought of which shallow writers are capable suggests as prudent, in order even to understand how the plain distinction between the two spheres of political action and religious belief can have been so far forgotten as appears to have been the case with some. Most certainly it is to wrap up sentences in



unskilful words, to darken counsel by words without knowledge, if we assume, what is untrue, that there is a fixed immutable Divinely appointed standard in politics in the ordinary English sense of the term, and then speak against a political party in language like that used by Cardinal Newman on the strength of our own gratuitous assumption. There have been half-crazed enthusiasts, who have tried to make themselves and others believe that Gothic architecture or Gregorian music belongs to the *depositum* of revelation, and have spoken of all other styles or kinds as heresies and wickednesses. This is exactly the sort of craze, in the sphere of simple politics, with which we occasionally meet.

The reasonable view of the matter is, happily, far too generally recognized to need any lengthened exposition. In the English sense of the word, there always have been, and there always will be, Catholic Conservatives and Catholic Liberals. It has often been said that it is a benefit to the Catholic cause in a country like ours that distinguished Catholics are to be found in the ranks of both of the great parties into which Englishmen are divided—as far, that is, as they are really divided at all. For there is far less of real division as to the practical principles of government and of legislation than there is of real union among us. We are, happily, not divided, as it is the misfortune of Frenchmen, for instance, to be divided, as to the form of our government, as to the relative powers of the Estates of which it is made up, or as to our allegiance to the dynasty. In all these matters, and a thousand more, the country with us is before party, and any party leader that attempted to change this state of things would very soon be a leader without followers. Questions arise from time to time, such as those which affect education, or again, such as relate to the foreign policy of the Empire, as to which we may have to feel, as Catholics, that the interests which ought to be still dearer to us than those of national aggrandizement may make it necessary for us to rally, as a body, to one of the great political parties rather than to another. But such questions are not always rife, and on looking back over the history of the present century we find that our gratitude has not been exclusively due either to Liberals or Conservatives. If for a time the Catholics as a body have been on one side rather than on the other, it has been the wisdom of its leaders not to pledge it blindly to an adhesion

to either side as such. We are thus able to make our voice heard, as to matters of practical and daily moment, in the councils of one party as well as in those of the other. All this would be at an end, if the distinction between Liberalism in politics and Liberalism in religion were to be lost sight of. So it would be in England, and abroad the Catholics would either be tied down in hopeless bondage to the Conservatism of a Bismarck or a Gortschakoff, or condemned to absolute political inaction. Such is not the line now taken by the great Catholic party in Germany, such was not the line taken a generation ago by men like O'Connell and Montalembert. In our country, certainly, the Catholic votes in Parliament and at the elections have, during the half century since Emancipation been given more to the Liberal side in politics than to the Conservative side. But this is no proof that Catholics have not been as true Conservatives, in the highest sense of the term, as any of their fellow-citizens. It has been chiefly caused by the accident that the measures in which Catholics have been more directly interested have come from the Liberal side, a circumstance which may change at any moment, and which indeed can hardly be said not to have changed in the last few years, at least as to one or two very important matters. At the beginning of this century the Conservatism of the time—under the name of Toryism—pledged itself to the maintaining of the system of unjust and tyrannical refusal of civil liberties to Catholics in every sphere. The legislation of many centuries had been distinctly anti-Catholic, and the application of the principle of Conservatism to such legislation was necessarily hostile to our religion. Now this is no longer so. The onward sweep of political change has given us all, or nearly all, that we want, as far as legislation can give it, and it is perfectly natural that, like other people who are content with things as they are, and who at least do not desire change out of fear that the change may be for the worse, Catholics among us should become strong Conservatives.

This leads us to another consideration. It is not at all impossible for the progress of legislation, in a country like our own, to sweep beyond the point at which the neutrality of Catholics must cease. If the Cardinal of St. George has not mentioned the enactment of stringent laws concerning secular education as one of the measures adopted by the Liberalism which he has always opposed, it is perhaps because with us it



has not yet come to that. For it is one thing to wish for secular education, another to impose it exclusively by law. Here we have a point at which continental Liberals make it impossible for the political power of Catholics to ally itself with them. At this moment, as we all know, continental Liberalism, both in France and in Belgium, is showing that it is not willing to confine itself to the political sphere—that it is determined to attack the Church as to a matter concerning which she is bound by the duty which she owes to her Divine Lord to be extremely sensitive. What has happened elsewhere may happen, though from different causes, in England. It is tolerably certain that, whenever the movement for the destruction of the present system of denominational education is made the subject-matter of political agitation, and is brought to the front in Parliament, it will divide both parties as they at present exist. On each side there are men who will fight for religious education. It is well known that the measure of the last Government for the establishment of a national University in Ireland failed of success quite as much on account of the jealousies of Liberals as of the hostility of Conservatives. It is well known, on the other hand, that the present Government was itself divided at the beginning of the current session of Parliament on the same subject, and that one reason for which the Bill now connected with the name of the O'Connor Don was not made a Government measure was the fear of opposition on the part of certain supporters of the Government. Still, it is quite possible that at some future time the secular and obligatory education which is one of the favourite weapons of the Liberalism against which Cardinal Newman speaks so strongly, might be made a part of the programme of a party calling itself Liberal in the ordinary English sense. Such a measure, from whatever side it came, would have to be opposed by all Catholics, to whatever political party they might belong. We should then have an instance in which English Liberalism had crossed the line up to which any one, whether Catholic or Protestant, who values religious education aright, could possibly follow them.

It is, however, not difficult to see that if such a measure as that of which we speak were ever made a part of the programme of a so-called Liberal party in this country, it would involve a practical abandonment on the part of the party of the true principles of political Liberalism. Liberalism professes to be essentially tolerant, the adversary of monopolies, the

considerate protector of the rights of conscience and of private citizens as such. That is just as much a part of its normal profession, as the respect for antiquity and prerogative is a part of the normal profession of Conservatism. But to compel Catholics and others—for the objection to secular education is just as strong on the part of the Anglicans as on the part of Catholics—to send their children to State schools the teaching of which was hostile to their religion, would be an act of tyranny as great as any that is now practised in the case of the Catholic subjects of the Czar. The truth is, that in such a case as that which we are supposing, we should have to contend, not against any of the principles which underlie true political Liberalism, but against that undue exaltation of the State which was the result of the Reformation. Europe has never been truly Conservative, in the highest sense, since the influence and authority of the Church and of religion over the whole of social and political life was first weakened and then destroyed by the great catastrophes of the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. The treaty of Westphalia was the recognition of the principle of indifference in religion by the nations which once had formed the compact body of Christendom. As soon as the Church lost her power, it was inevitable that the undue magnification of the secular power should begin. It first took the form of the absurd exaltation of royalty, which was made into a dogma by the teaching of the divine right of Kings, which in England produced the Great Rebellion and in France issued in the destruction of the political vitality of the nation under the *régime* of Louis the Fourteenth. The last hundred years have witnessed the chastisement of the royal houses, which have everywhere lost their power, and in many countries have been driven from their thrones. But it is a mistake to think that the evil engendered by the Reformation has ceased to live with the humiliation of royalty. The idea of the predominance of the State is the Pagan idea of government and of society, and it can be as pernicious under a republican *régime* as under the empire of a Bonaparte or the sceptre of a Bourbon. It is an idea which naturally leads to the persecution of a power like that of Christianity. It is an exclusive idea, which can allow of no independence of State control anywhere. It may call itself Liberalism if it likes, or Conservatism if it likes, but it is simple despotism and tyranny. Whether in the hands of Napoleon, or of Jules Ferry, it has nothing in common with

the principle of advance and progress and emancipation and increase of liberty and extension of the range of political power, any more than with the principle of any true Conservatism which Christians can profess. True Liberals, in the English sense, are its natural enemies almost as much as, on other grounds, the Church herself.

The Cardinal of St. George concludes his address by a confident hope that the Church will triumph over this great enemy as over all others. Certainly it would seem as if the principle of which we are speaking carried in itself the earnest of its own defeat. Its defeat may be prophesied alike from its tyranny and from its inefficiency and weakness. Its tyranny must sooner or later make it intolerable, and, on the other hand, it is certain to fail in the attempt to supplant the influence of the Church and of religion in securing peace and order. It seems likely to endeavour to lay on the shoulders of mankind a yoke heavier to bear than that of the most despotic of emperors and kings, and on the other, to give them nothing in return, and so to drive back to the Church the distracted nations of Europe. It will do this by the very cogency of the proof from experience that it can give them neither peace with one another, nor tranquillity at home, as some apparent recompense for the grinding oppression under which it makes them writhe.

## *The Native Tribes of North America and the Catholic Missions.*

---

### V.—ALGONQUIN TRIBES.—MISSIONS AMONG THE ABNAKIS, MICMACS, AND ETCHEMINS.

1. *Abnakis*.—The old mission of St. Sauveur, at the mouth the Penobscot River, seemed to be forgotten after its destruction by Argal. The new effort which was going to be made for the thorough conversion of the Abnakis appears to have had no connection with the first. The Recollet Fathers, who replaced the Jesuits, turned their attention to the Micmacs and Etchemins of Acadia, who were quite near, but of another race, though originally Algonquin likewise. They established themselves in 1619 on the banks of the St. John's River, in a locality very different, though not very distant from that of Port Royal, and remained there, or in the neighbourhood, until the arrival of Father Druilletes in Maine, in 1646, even much later.

The Abnakis seem to have been so thoroughly forgotten, that it required a very extraordinary circumstance to bring them back to the recollection of the Fathers living at Quebec. In 1642, some of them, still pagan, who appear never to have heard of the Jesuits, were rambling in the wild country between their country and the St. Lawrence, when they were treacherously made prisoners by a party of pagan Algonquins, who treated them with the greatest barbarity. This soon became known at the new establishment of St. Joseph, or Sillery, near Quebec. It was a kind of Christian Reduction, founded some time before, at the expense of Noel de Sillery, Commander of Malta, a rich and pious French nobleman. The Christian Indians of this village, which at that time reproduced all the virtues, particularly the charity, of the primitive Church at Jerusalem, hastened to rescue the poor Abnakis from their tormentors, and brought them to Sillery. There was precisely at that spot an hospital which the good Commander had generously founded, and which was given to the care of some nuns, called *hospitalières*. The

kind treatment the pagan Abnakis received here made such a deep impression upon them, that they openly expressed their intention of becoming Christian, and remaining with their rescuers. One of them, however, thought it was but right and proper, to visit his country again, and acquaint the people with all the circumstances which have just been briefly narrated. He started, therefore, for Maine, accompanied by one of the most fervent Christians of Sillery, called Charles Meiaskwat, and both accomplished their journey without mishap.

The village at which they arrived was not situated on the Penobscot, but on the Kennebec, a stream running parallel to the first, and at a good distance west of it. It was known under the name of Coussinoc, and some English immigrants, who had already settled in the neighbourhood, and soon built a town of their own, called it Augusta. The adventure related by the two Indians coming from Quebec, made, of course, a great deal of noise in the country, and the Abnaki who had narrowly escaped from death extolled so highly the greatness of the Christian doctrine, that many were filled with the desire of knowing and practising it.

The great majority of the Abnakis declared in fact that they also wished to become Christians, and though the Fathers in Canada could then scarcely spare any of their men, Father Druilletes was sent, in 1646, on the condition that he should remain with them only six months. Their joy at his first arrival, and their grief at his departure, are graphically described in the *Rélation* for 1652. But after he had left, the Indians of Maine could not rest satisfied until they saw him again on the Kennebec, and he remained this time long enough in the midst of his dear neophytes to form of them permanently a Christian tribe, whose faith has never been shaken during more than two centuries, and endures still in our day.

To understand thoroughly the cause of the vicissitudes through which they had subsequently to pass, and the extraordinary temptations their newly-planted faith was subjected to, a word must be said on the political aspect the Abnaki country was then assuming, which became a constant source of difficulty for those missions, and has continued almost the same till after the first quarter of this century.

It is perfectly well expressed by Mr. George Bancroft in his *History of the Colonization of the United States*:<sup>1</sup> "The

<sup>1</sup> Tom. iii. p. 339.

limit of jurisdiction between England and France was not easy of adjustment. Canada, by its original charter, comprised the whole basin of the St. Lawrence, and that part of Vermont and New York which is watered by streams flowing to the St. Lawrence had ever been regarded by France as Canadian territory. The boat of Champlain had entered the lake that makes his name a familiar word, in the same summer in which Hudson ascended the North River. Holland had never dispossessed the French, and the conquest and surrender of New Netherlands to the English could transfer no more than the possessions of Holland. There was, therefore, no act of France relinquishing its claim till the treaty of Utrecht. The ambiguous language of that treaty," &c.

The celebrated American historian, in his subsequent reflections, evidently inclines towards admitting the claims of France, and every fair minded man will be disposed to adopt the same conclusion. There can be no other view of it, in fact, for the time which preceded the treaty of Utrecht, in 1713, that is, for more than half a century after the mission of Druilletes among the Abnakis. But there was, unfortunately, the colony of Massachusetts, with its capital, Boston, from which the Kennebec could be reached by sea much quicker than from Quebec by land, and this became the great source of all the difficulties which soon beset the new establishments. It has just been seen that in his first voyage Druilletes found English immigrants settled in the midst of the Indians along the Kennebec. In his trips on the river he often met with them, and admired the beauty of the farms which they had already inclosed, and where they lived peaceably and in great comfort. From every mention made in the *Relations* of these occurrences, it is evident that the greatest harmony and good will existed between him and the new English colonists. They had hailed his first coming with pleasure, as they expected that his influence over the Indians would promote peace on both sides.

It would have been happy indeed if the same disposition had continued to prevail. But it was difficult to suppose that the Puritans living then in Boston would cherish the same favourable sentiments. How could they look without rancour on large congregations of Catholic Indians spiritually governed by Jesuit missionaries? And their ill-will could find an excellent pretext in the fact that the northern and eastern boundaries of their New England provinces remained undetermined during the



whole colonial period. The martyrdom of Rasle and the temporary destruction of those missions at different epochs were the unhappy consequences of the want of foresight on the part of France, which seems never to have understood sufficiently well the importance of coming to a clear understanding with England on the subject of boundary.

Still, in Canada at least, that importance was very early felt, since the *Jesuit Relations* state positively in several places that Druilletes visited Boston at least twice, as the special envoy of Montmagny, the worthy successor of Champlain in the governorship of Canada. The object of his embassy and the nature of his instructions remain to this day almost unknown, and nothing is said about them in any of the letters from Quebec which we have read. It seems, however, certain that the good Father had several conferences in Boston with Eliot, the Protestant missionary of the Indians around that city, the only man of whom Protestantism can boast as having carried the Gospel to the red men. It seems that Eliot received Druilletes with the same kindness which Dominic Megapolensis at a later date showed to Father Jogues at Albany.

Of the precise object of this mission from the Governor of Canada to the New England colonies, very little, as we have said, is known. Mr. J. G. Shea thinks that the authorities at Boston "had proposed a kind of alliance, to which the French Governor acceded, provided the New Englanders would aid Canada against the Iroquois." Mr. Shea, who gives no reference for the statement, can be believed on account not only of his extensive knowledge of everything connected with the Catholic missions, but also of his intimate acquaintance with the general history of the United States and Canada during colonial times. But it is clear also that this special mission of Father Druilletes could not succeed, because the alliance of the Iroquois with England was the mainstay of English policy in North America.

It is time to return to the narrative of the labours of Father Druilletes and his successors among the Abnakis. In his two journeys from Quebec to their villages in 1646 and 1650, the missionary had suffered from the climate and the roughness of the roads, almost beyond belief; but from the first moment of his arrival he felt fully recompensed by the ardour of the whole tribe and the prospect of their conversion to Christianity. The great majority sincerely wished it, and as a sure test of their good will, Druilletes required of them three conditions, which

probably he would not have obtained from any other Indian community. The first was to abstain totally from the use of the strong drinks, which the Europeans had already imported among them. The second was to bind themselves not to engage in bloody feuds with men of their own tribe, a thing of frequent occurrence with all the families of red men. The last was to renounce directly their superstitions and destroy their manitous and amulets.

Strange to say he found no difficulty in obtaining these pledges from them; and though occasionally some individual Abnaki failed in keeping his promises, the mass remained faithful, and the backslider himself was always brought back to a better life. What has been said in a former paper of Indian fickleness was thus scarcely true of this Algonquin tribe; and this is the more remarkable, that living far from Canada, not having under their eyes the spectacle of other Christian communities, and Christian worship, they were undoubtedly exposed to more constant temptations than the Montagnais, for instance, near Quebec, or the Algonquins proper near Montreal. And let the reader remember it; this lasted more than two centuries; and they were often deprived of all spiritual guidance, whilst all other Indian races in the north and east had always a number of priests belonging to religious orders to instruct them and support them. In these circumstances the steadfastness of the Abnakis is certainly very remarkable.

A long interruption of steady missionary labour among them took place precisely after the last removal of Father Druilletes in 1656. The fierce wars of the Iroquois against the Hurons obliged the Fathers to concentrate all their force in the west, in order to afford spiritual help to this heroic people of Lake Huron, on the eve, apparently, of complete extinction. Not only all the Wyandot villages had to be provided with missionaries, in case of sudden attacks on the part of their barbarous foes; but when that devoted territory had to be abandoned, a number of Jesuits were required to lead the unfortunate people to their new homes, as they were to be dispersed east and west, and incorporated with other Indian tribes. On this account Druilletes was withdrawn and sent to the Hurons, and no successor could be given him on the Kennebec.

Mgr. Laval, however, the first Bishop of Quebec, landed on June 7, 1659; and soon after, combining his efforts with Father



Jerome Lallemant, who was again appointed Superior of all the Jesuit establishments, several missionaries were destined for the distant Abnaki villages. We have already seen that the Recollets had succeeded to the Jesuits in Acadia, and established themselves on the St. John's river, where they remained not only until this time, but much later. We know also that in his rambles as far as Boston Druilletes had met with a Convent of Capuchins at the mouth of the Penobscot, at or near the former mission of St. Sauveur. So the *Jesuit Relations* positively assert. This must have continued long after the withdrawal of Druilletes, as the Capuchins would not certainly have left the Penobscot without asking to be replaced by the Jesuits of the Kennebec. But, besides, the new Bishop of Quebec soon after this appointed several secular clergymen to Indian missions in Maine and Nova Scotia or Acadia. We shall soon have to speak of Thury, one of them, a zealous member of the Quebec Seminary. Thus the Abnakis were not altogether deprived of spiritual help.

This, however, would scarcely have sufficed for the numerous Indian villages scattered along the Kennebec River, and on this account the Jesuits thought of removing to Sillery, near Quebec, as many of the Christian Abnakis as were willing to go. A great number, it seems, consented, affording a new proof of their docility and attachment to religion, since nothing is so distasteful to the Indians as to abandon any place where they have lived for a long time.

More still; Sillery after awhile was found to be an undesirable place of residence for them. Its soil was already exhausted, and Quebec was found to be too near. Father James Bigot, therefore, chose a new site on the *Chaudière* River, whither the former colony was transplanted in 1683. It is known that by ascending this stream to its source the traveller finds himself near the Kennebec, which runs the contrary way; and thus the Abnakis could easily pass from their new residence to their old one, an operation very easy for Indians who travel mostly in canoes.

This led in fact to a complete restoration of the former mission of Father Druilletes at Coussinoc or Augusta, whither Father Bigot removed the Indian colony in 1688. But before he could do so he met with a difficulty from the French Fishery Company, of which it is proper to say a word, because at the same time the "fishing question" led to a fatal war between

England and France. The French Fishery Company had by its charter a monopoly of the whole eastern coast of North America as far nearly as Boston. The mouth of the Kennebec was included in their monopoly. If the Abnaki missions were restored along that stream, the Abnakis would fish along the coast, and this would interfere with the profits of those French monopolists. The representations of the Governor of Canada, Denonville, in a memorial to the French Court, prevailed against the pretensions of these gentlemen; and Father Bigot was allowed to undertake his holy work.

Thus even French Catholics often placed obstacles in the way of the missions. But what was more remarkable in this case was the strange fact that this altercation among Frenchmen opened the eyes of the English Government, or rather of the Puritans of Boston, to the importance of the fisheries, and after Father Bigot had established himself on the Kennebec in 1688, a war broke out between France and England the very next year, having for its object, on the part of the English Government, to drive away the Catholic missionaries from Maine and Acadia, and secure the fisheries to the New Englanders. A short narrative of its cause by Mr. George Bancroft is quite in point, and we give it.

"The attention of the Court of France had been directed to the fisheries; and Acadia had been represented by De Meules as the most important settlement of France. To protect it the Jesuits Vincent and James Bigot collected a village of the Abnakis on the Penobscot (it was Thury who had done so, and Thury was not a Jesuit); and a flourishing town now marks the spot where the Baron de St. Castin, a veteran officer of the regiment of Carignan, established a trading fort. Would France, it is said, strengthen its ports on the Penobscot, occupy the islands that command the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and send supplies to Newfoundland, she would be sole mistress of the fisheries for cod. Hence the strife with Massachusetts, in which the popular mind was so deeply interested, that, to this day, the figure of a cod-fish is suspended in the Hall of its representatives."<sup>2</sup>

This passage is most graphic and striking, in spite of some slight errors which it contains. The Abnaki village near the fort built by St. Castin was at that time governed spiritually by Thury of the Seminary of Quebec, a secular clergyman

<sup>2</sup> Vol. iii. p. 178.

sent there by Bishop Laval. He was not a Jesuit, as Mr. Bancroft asserts a few pages further, but a most zealous missionary. Fathers V. and J. Bigot were Jesuits, but they were then living on the Kennebec, and had nothing to do with the mission on the Penobscot. These corrections being made, it is proper to look at the war which broke out in fact in 1689, and relate a few of its incidents with which the missions are connected.

It is clear from what precedes that neither the Indians nor their spiritual guides had anything to do with causing it. It was a political affair between two great nations, and the Indians were only the victims of it. They, it is true, warmly espoused the French cause; but they had good reasons for it, and cannot be blamed on that account. In this war, which fell chiefly on the Abnakis of the Penobscot, Thury, their pastor, could not refuse to guide his flock, and prepare them for the conflict. He did not himself shoulder the musket, as several Protestant missionaries have done; but whilst the warriors of the tribe went to attack Fort Pemaquid, a stronghold of the Boston Puritans, he kept the old men, women, and children nearly all the time in the church. Before starting, the warriors "had all approached the sacraments with their wives and children, that the latter might raise pure hands to Heaven, while they were in deadly combat with the enemies of their race and faith. During the whole period of the expedition a Perpetual Rosary was established, not even the time of meals interrupting so edifying an exercise."<sup>3</sup>

The Indians took Fort Pemaquid, garrisoned by Bostonians, whilst the Iroquois siding with the English, captured Montreal in Canada from the French. On both sides barbarities were committed; but in Montreal far greater than in the Puritan fortress. The facts related by Mr. Bancroft in this last case are inexcusable; but their truth depends altogether on Puritan records, and certainly the death of Waldron cannot be attributed to this expedition. Suppose, however, that the Abnaki warriors had been guilty of similar atrocities, can they be laid to the charge of Thury and of those who prayed with him in his "Perpetual Rosary?" Mr. Bancroft, nearly always fair and just when speaking of the Christian Indians and their spiritual rulers, assumes here an accusing tone, and complains chiefly that Charlevoix in relating subsequently these very facts extols

<sup>3</sup> J. G. Shea.

the bravery of the Abnakis, and does not condemn "the murder and scalping of the inhabitants of peaceful villages."

Charlevoix and the Catholic missionaries in general have spoken often enough in condemnation of those horrors; and because he is silent about them on this occasion, it is not a proof that he approves of them; and very certainly it is not a reason for thinking that Thury and his "praying band" were engaged in asking of God the successful carrying on of such atrocities as these.

Meanwhile the war ended favourably for France, though Mr. Bancroft estimates the French population at only one-twentieth of the English. The Abnaki missions could continue in peace, though unfortunately the boundary question was not settled even then. J. G. Shea gives a list of the Jesuit Fathers who succeeded each other after the two Bigots at the head of the missions on the Kennebec. They are Julian Binneteau, Joseph Aubery, Peter de la Chasse, Sebastian Rasle, &c.

Brevity being absolutely required here, we must confine ourselves to the labours of this last holy man. When he reached Norridgwalk on the Kennebec, in 1695, the Abnakis were all Christian. Under his rule the happiness of his whole flock attracted the attention of the other Indians, and a small tribe, called the Amalingans, came from a distant country, to ascertain the truth of what they had heard. Finding the reality more admirable still than the rumour, they joined their lodges to those of the Abnakis, and were incorporated with the tribe.

The Treaty of Utrecht (1713) had spoken ambiguously of the boundary between the French and the English colonies in America; and the New Englanders interpreting it in their favour, the Abnakis were surprised to hear that Boston claimed the whole eastern coast as far as Cape Breton, considered consequently their own country between the Kennebec and the St. Croix rivers as a part of New England, and had already laid the foundation of new settlements among them, which they protected by forts. Mr. Bancroft must be quoted here:

"Away went their chiefs across the forests to Quebec, to ask if France had indeed surrendered the country of which they themselves were the rightful lords, "and as Vandreuil (the Governor of Canada) answered that the Treaty of which the English spoke made no mention of their country, their chief resisted the claim of the Government of Massachusetts. "I have my land," said he, "where the Great Spirit has placed

me; and while their remains one child of my tribe, I shall fight to preserve it."

Such was the distressing position of those poor Christians. What chiefly irritated the English colonists was the deep attachment of the Indians to France and to the French missionaries. Father Rasle's church having been wantonly destroyed in 1705 by a party of New Englanders, the Abnakis had to be satisfied at first with a wooden chapel; but, after several years, they thought of rebuilding it more sumptuously than before; and unable at that time to procure workmen from Quebec, a deputation of chiefs went to Boston to obtain masons and carpenters whom they promised to pay.

"The Governor," says Mr. J. G. Shea, "eager to gain them over to his side, offered to rebuild their church at his own expense, if they would dismiss their missionary and take one of his choice. Indignant at this, the Indian speaker replied: 'When you first came here, you saw me long before the French governors, but neither your predecessors nor your ministers ever spoke to me of prayer or the Great Spirit. They saw my furs, my beaver and moose skins, and they thought of nothing else; these alone they sought, and so eagerly that I have not been able to supply them enough. When I had much, they were my friends, and only then. One day my canoe missed the route, until at last I landed near Quebec, in a great village of the Algonquins, where the Black-gowns were teaching. Scarcely had I arrived when one of them came to see me. I was loaded with furs, but the Black-gown of France disdained to look at them: he spoke to me of the Great Spirit, of Heaven, of Hell, of the prayer which is the only way to reach Heaven . . . at last the prayer pleased me, and I asked to be instructed. I solicited baptism and received it . . . Thus have the French acted. Had you spoken of the prayer as soon as we met, I should now be so unhappy as to pray like you. . . . Now I hold to the prayer of the French. Keep your men, your gold and your minister; I will go to my French father.'"

Not satisfied with the first effort to gain the Abnakis over, the New Englanders sent to them Protestant ministers whom they would not listen to. Protestant chapels were built in some of their villages; no Abnaki would enter them. According to Mr. Bancroft: "The Government of Massachusetts attempted to establish a mission; and its minister made a mockery of Purgatory and the invocation of saints, of the Cross, and the

Rosary. 'My Christians,' retorted Rasles, "believe the truths of the Catholic faith, but are not skilful disputants," and he himself prepared a defence of the Roman Church. Thus Calvin and Loyola met in the woods of Maine. But the Protestant minister, unable to compete with the Jesuit for the affections of the Indians, returned to Boston, while 'the friar remained, the incendiary of mischief.'"<sup>4</sup>

The whole subsequent history of the great missionary cannot be given here. It is known how he was murdered in 1724, and the Abnaki village destroyed. He was a true martyr to the cause of religion; and his murderers could only accuse him of preaching the Catholic faith, and possessing the entire confidence and affection of his neophytes.

Mr. Bancroft, however, is mistaken when he says that he was "the last Catholic missionary in New England." The celebrated historian supposes that after this outrage of the Puritan Westbrooke, the Abnakis either disappeared or lost their religion, or at least had no one to preach it to them after Rasles. Mr. J. G. Shea amply supplies this deficiency of Bancroft, and carries the history of this mission down to our own day.

2. *Micmacs and Etchemins*.—Of these two Algonquin tribes, the first roamed over that part of Acadia which is now called Nova Scotia; the second was limited to the boundaries of what is now New Brunswick. Details can scarcely be given of the Catholic missions among them, because very few records indeed have been preserved. The reader must be satisfied with a most meagre account.

When Potrin-court first went to Acadia, having Champlain for his lieutenant, they found the Micmacs everywhere. But those Indians, although among the lowest of the Algonquin tribes, were not the brutal savages they are represented to be in most modern relations. Beamish Murdoch, in his *History of Nova Scotia*,<sup>5</sup> printed in 1865, relates that there are still at this time "remnants of Indian tribes, often half-castes, living around our larger towns and villages, in an indolent, miserable, and beggarly condition." But he says that "our people are apt to judge of the Micmac race by such unfortunate specimens, and in this way a very low estimate of the Micmacs is adopted." He thinks, however, that when Europeans first came to Acadia, the Indians were in a much more flourishing condition, and he

<sup>4</sup> Vol. iii. p. 334.

<sup>5</sup> Chap. i. Appendix.



gives details of their dress, their manners, and the kind disposition they invariably showed towards the strangers, which denote anything but barbarism. Memberton, the chief of the tribe at Port Royal, sat every day at the table of Potrin-court, with his daughter and train; and he soon became a Christian, and would probably have induced all his clansmen to follow him, had he not soon sickened and died.

A French ecclesiastic, whom Fathers Biard and Masse found in the country when they arrived, had already received as catechumens a number of red men. He baptized them much too soon, and before they were fully instructed; but this circumstance itself is a proof that the Indians were well disposed, and would not have offered any great obstacle to the reception of Christianity.

The question, therefore, may be asked, How is it that after such hopeful beginnings, the Micmacs proved themselves after a while to be but indifferent Christians? The chief reason of it is derived from the subsequent history of Acadia, whose constant revolutions interfered with the missions more, perhaps, than was the case in any other country in North America. This has to be seen a little more in detail.

Owing to the position of this vast peninsula, just in front of the great fishing-banks of Newfoundland, it became from the beginning, and continued to be all through colonial times, a cause of contention between the French and the English; so that its history, during more than two hundred years, is nothing but a confused narrative of successive and often violent exchanges from one of these great nations to the other. This is remarkable, and explains satisfactorily the poor success of the Catholic missions in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, because these two provinces, known in their complexity under the name of Acadia, were constantly shifting from the authority of a great Catholic power to that of a bitterly Protestant nation.

It is curious to see this somewhat in detail. First, France establishes her claim, and Port Royal is founded in 1605. Secondly, James the First of England grants all Nova Scotia (so he named it), including New Brunswick, to Sir William Alexander, in 1621. This Scottish nobleman established directly his "Order of Nova Scotia Baronets," and divided the peninsula into "Scotch baronetcies." The number of knights was to be one hundred and fifty, and the insignia of the order are given

at length in Mr. B. Murdoch's *History*.<sup>6</sup> Thirdly, Charles the First of England restores Acadia to France in 1632. Fourthly, Robert Sedgewick, under the authority of his Highness Oliver (Cromwell) Protector, &c., dated February, 8, 1653, takes possession of all the French settlements in Acadia. Fifthly, by the treaty of Breda, between Charles the Second of England and Louis the Fourteenth of France, Acadia is restored to France in 1667. Sixthly, according to Mr. B. Murdoch, there was again a short occupation of the country by the English between 1680 and 1682.<sup>7</sup> Seventhly, in 1691 there was an ample grant of Acadia to Massachusetts from William and Mary of England, quoted in full by Mr. Murdoch.<sup>8</sup> Eighthly, by the treaty of Utrecht, April 11, 1713, Acadia was given to England for the last time, and has ever since remained in her possession.

It is impossible to place under a clearer light the difficulties Catholic missionaries must have constantly met with in their efforts to convert the Indians. It is true that it is not mentioned anywhere that a single Protestant minister was ever sent to the Acadians, as was the case with the Abnakis; but it is not at all likely that when the peninsula was under the control of the British Government, the French missionaries were favoured and encouraged in their holy labours. The reverse certainly must have been the case, and chiefly because the authority of England over that unfortunate country was generally confided to Boston officials, who were not at that time very much in love with Catholicity, which they called Papism, and with priests or religious, to whom they applied coarse epithets.

But to render the case more desperate still, it is known by many historical details that the two great nations which were constantly wrangling about this country, had only one idea of the usefulness of the Indians, and this was that they could serve them in their wars against each other. A moment given to this reflection will sufficiently well explain why the poor Micmacs have so frightfully deteriorated, and have been at all times such indifferent Catholics.

Before the Europeans arrived, they were not generally given to war. Their almost insular position exempted them from the constant incursions of the barbarous tribes south and west. The Iroquois never thought of attacking them; but, as was seen, they invariably followed in their warlike expeditions the Mohawk and Oswego rivers, and fell upon the Algonquin tribes

<sup>6</sup> Tom. i. p. 68.

<sup>7</sup> Vol. i. p. 158.

<sup>8</sup> Vol. i. p. 197.



north of Lake Ontario. All the attempts at war on the part of the Micmacs were reduced to clannish feuds against their immediate neighbours; and the ravages consequent upon their domestic differences seldom extended beyond the territory of the next village. Potrincourt, in his first voyage, found Memberton engaged into such an occupation with a small sept of the neighbourhood. These social wrangles, it is well known, are never fatal to the prosperity of small tribes, and consequently the Micmacs were prosperous, as they found plenty of game and fish all around, and they do not seem to have ever experienced the pangs of hunger frequent among other red men.

But as soon as Frenchmen and Englishmen set foot in their midst, the social state of that unfortunate Algonquin nation was suddenly changed for the worst. Being naturally of a kind disposition, and always very friendly to the Europeans who settled near them, they were gradually induced to share in all their national quarrels; and every small troop of English or French going to attack a fort of the enemy or destroy the crops of some adverse settlers, was invariably accompanied by a far more numerous array of painted warriors who could know nothing of the main object of the expedition.

This will render the narrative of missions among them, such as it can be given, sufficiently complete, but short and sad. The Jesuit Fathers having withdrawn after the brutal attack of Argal, the Recollets took possession of the country in the name of Holy Church; and they appear to have been all along the main stay of all the missions in Acadia, with the exception of a few secular clergymen sent in general from Quebec. The good Franciscans established themselves on the St. John's River, which became their centre; and in fact it was excellently chosen, as it is the largest stream of the peninsula, and its basin is central to it. It is unfortunate that they do not seem to have ever acquired the habit of regularly corresponding with their brethren in France. We are thus almost without authentic records, and the whole story has to be patched up from mere bits of information.

At Port Royal we find at a very early date a church with a *curé*, who was probably a secular clergyman, since the Recollets are said to have begun their establishments on some northern branch of the St. John's River at a good distance from Port Royal. At the mouth of the same river a fort had been built by the French, which became of great importance, and from

its harbour many of the expeditions, intended to help the Abnakis in Maine in their struggles against the New Englanders, started on various occasions. There were always a number of Indians around that fort, and it must have been a most important point for the Recollets. It is mentioned especially on several occasions by Mr. Murdoch, that they were residing at that precise spot.

From documents quoted by the same historian, it is manifest that the attack on Fort Pemaquid was not undertaken only by the Abnakis under Thury, but that a great number of Micmacs coming from Fort St. John had joined them. Mr. Bancroft was altogether unaware of this circumstance. Some of them had come even from Cape Breton. At the fort near the mouth of St. John's River, the Indians found at that time a secular clergyman by the name of Baudouin, who baptized some of them, married others, and heard the confessions of all. Many interesting details on this expedition are given by Mr. Murdoch in his *History of Nova Scotia*.<sup>9</sup> By these we learn that the *curé* at Port Royal was M. de Mandoux, no doubt a secular clergyman also, who had succeeded M. Petit. The subservience of the Indians to the Europeans is manifest from all these details.

No mention whatever is made in this narrative of atrocities on the part of the Indians after the surrender of Pemaquid. It is said only that the garrison was carried in shallops to an island near a French man-of-war "in order that they might be protected from the revenge of the Indians" on account of a treacherous murder of some of them the year before by the Puritans.

In the year following many curious facts are detailed by the historian of Nova Scotia, which confirm the account already given of the Catholic missions. Thus, "on the 21st of June, M. de St. Cosme, *curé* of Mines, had brought fifty Indians of his mission to St. John." "On July 10th, two canoes full of Micmacs arrived." "On July 17th, twenty-one Micmacs came." "On July 26th, M. de Villebon sent off seventy-two Indians of St. John's River, with the Recollet Father, their missionary, to join the others at Pentagoet." "M. de St. Cosme and Father Simon the Recollets had gone to conduct the *Bay of Fundy Indians*, to the number of two hundred or thereabouts," &c. The Indians always follow the French troops.

<sup>9</sup> Vol. i. pp. 217, seq.

The other accounts which we could give would be exactly similar to these, and it is useless to quote further. But if all this confirms what has been said of the establishment of Christianity among the Micmacs, in the midst of social and political trouble, the reader is left in perfect ignorance of the means employed for their conversion. There is no doubt, however, that the immense majority, if not the totality, of the Micmac tribe embraced the religion of Christ, and might have continued prosperous, had it not been for those savage wars between the French and English. It is not, of course, our purpose to speak of the final expulsion of the French Acadians, after the last surrender of the peninsula to England. Our present purpose confines us to the history of the Indians, no one of whom was ever banished from this country.

3. *The Etchemins*.—Of this tribe of Indians which inhabited the northern part of Acadia, now called New Brunswick, so little is related in the various records and documents which have preserved the memory of ancient times in that country, that it is almost impossible to say anything which could satisfy the reader. When Father Biard landed at Port Royal in 1611, he thought that this Etchemin tribe contained two thousand five hundred individuals, and he calculated the number of the Micmacs at only three thousand or three thousand five hundred. The Etchemins were consequently scarcely inferior in number to the Micmacs. Still, in all the ancient relations concerning Acadia, Micmacs are spoken of everywhere; scarcely a word is said of the Etchemins. What seems to us the probable cause of this is, that, although the difference between the two tribes had been particularly remarked by the first Europeans who landed, very little account was made of it by the colonists who succeeded. In this case, the northern tribe must have been ever afterwards confounded with the southern one, and it is clear that the Etchemins must have been converted like the Micmacs. This is nearly the only thing which can be said of them.

In the American Catholic Directory for this year (1879), speaking of the diocese of Chatham, which comprises the northern half of the province of New Brunswick, it is stated that at Grand Falls, County Victoria, "Rev. John J. O'Leary resides, and attends, besides, the church at the Indian mission at Tobique." It would be interesting, if it were still possible, to ascertain whether that mission is an outcome of the Etchemins or of the Micmacs.

The next paper will speak of the Catholic missions among the western Algonquins, extending as far as the Mississippi and farther. These tribes are in every way superior to those of the east, and even large confederacies existed among them. On this account their history possesses a far higher degree of interest than that of the eastern tribes.

A. J. THEBAUD.

### *Gleanings among Old Records.*

---

#### VI.—MARY STUART, QUEEN OF SCOTS, AND CLAUDE NAU.<sup>1</sup>

THE extracts from Nau's history of Mary Stuart which were given in our last number commence with his version of the incidents which occurred during the flight of the royal party from Holyrood to Dunbar, shortly after the murder of David Rizzio, and they are continued to the day on which Darnley took up his abode in the ill-omened "House of Field," the scene of his assassination. Of these events Nau has there been permitted to give his own account in his own way, without note or comment. This course has been adopted advisedly. His narrative is so novel, and at the same time so picturesque, it carries with it such a convincing air of simple truthfulness, his estimate of the motives by which the Scottish Queen was influenced and of the policy which she adopted are so natural and so reasonable, that to have interrupted the story as he is telling it would have been at once unjust and unbecoming. The period, however, has now arrived at which some remarks upon these statements may reasonably be expected.

The novelty and the importance of most of these details are unquestionable. The narrative for which we are indebted to Mary's French secretary fills up a period of her history of exceptional interest, and respecting which we have hitherto been left in comparative ignorance. Looking at it as a whole, it will be admitted, I think, that it bears the appearance of truthfulness. The incidents here recorded are probable in themselves; they hang well together; they are consistent with the scanty information which has come to us from other sources; and they do not violently contradict any well-established fact. Upon the whole, therefore, there is a strong antecedent presumption in favour of their credibility. And more than this ought not to be demanded or expected.

It happens, however, that it is in my power to produce an

<sup>1</sup> Continued from n. xlv. p. 99.

unexpected witness, who will confirm the truth of one of the leading incidents in the history just recorded.

Nau tells us that, among the few trusted persons who accompanied Mary and Darnley in their midnight ride were "one servant of the bedchamber and two or three soldiers." We are now able to identify one of these as Anthony Standen, who survived until the year 1604, and then, oppressed with poverty and old age, presented a petition to James the First, then King of England, from which I derive the following particulars.

Sir Anthony Standen, for such was the rank of the petitioner, tells King James that he became acquainted with Henry Darnley when they both frequented the Court of Queen Elizabeth. In 1565, shortly after Darnley had gone into Scotland, he was followed by Standen and his brother, both of whom passed into the royal household, the elder as Master of the Horse to the King, the younger as his cupbearer. The petitioner was present at the murder of Riccio (for so he gives the name), and tells us that, "in this bloody tumult and press, one of Ruthven's followers offered to fix his poinard in the Queen's left side, which Standen, by his nearness to her, well advising, turned aside by laying a grip upon the dagger, and wrested it from this traitor, by which means (though not without exposing his own) Standen saved two lives together, a service which their Majesties esteemed and valued accordingly."

"The two distressed princes," continues Sir Anthony, "upon the execution of so detestable an act, finding themselves captives to their rebellious subjects, sought means to wind out and save themselves the next night following, which was happily put in practice and as fortunately succeeded. Herein Standen's fidelity was by the Queen chiefly made proof of, and three others besides were also to be trusted and used, that is to say, John Stuart, laird of Traquair, captain of the guard, William his brother, and Arthur Erskin. These, seven in number, secretly stole away after midnight from Holyrood House toward the Castle of Dunbar, twenty long miles from thence, into which strength being entered after some difficulty, three princes' lives were by God's blessing miraculously put in safety."

We may now resume our extracts from the original manuscript of these *Memoirs of Queen Mary of Scotland*. Nau is telling us of the events which occurred in the house of the "Kirk of Field," and he continues his narrative in the following words :



When he arrived in Edinburgh the King lodged in a small house outside the town, which had been chosen on the recommendation of James Balfour and some others. This was against the Queen's wishes, who was anxious that her husband should go to Craigmillar, for he could not stay in Holyrood Palace lest he should communicate the infection to the Prince. On his own account, too, he did not wish any one to see him in his present condition, nor indeed until he had gone through a course of baths in private. He always wore a piece of taffeta before his face, and the window of his room was never opened. While in this house he was often visited by the Queen, with whom he was now perfectly reconciled. He promised to give her much information, of the utmost importance to the life and quiet of both of them. He spoke of the necessity of cultivating a good understanding with each other, and of guarding against certain individuals (whose names he said he would reveal) who had suggested an attempt upon her life. The designs of these persons aimed at the ruin of both of them, as would appear more clearly ere long by their plans and actions. Here he warned the Queen more particularly against Lethington. That very night, as she was about to leave the King, she met Paris, Bothwell's *valet-de-chambre*, and noticing that his face was all blackened with gunpowder, she exclaimed, in the hearing of many of the lords, just as she was mounting her horse, "Jesu, Paris, how begrimed you are!"

On the 10th of February, 1567, about three or four o'clock in the morning, a match was put to the gunpowder which had been placed under the Queen's residence. It afterwards came out that this had been done by the command and device of the Earls of Bothwell and Morton, James Balfour, and some others, who always afterwards pretended to be most diligent in searching out the murder which they themselves had committed. Morton had secretly returned from England, to which he had been banished.

This crime was the result of a bond into which they had entered. It was written by Alexander Hay, at that time one of the Clerks of the Council, and signed by the Earls of Moray, Huntley, Bothwell, and Morton, by Lethington, James Balfour, and others, who combined for this purpose. They asserted that they were acting for the public good of the realm, by freeing the Queen from the bondage and misery into which she had been reduced by the King's behaviour. They promised to support

each other, and to avouch that the act was done justly and lawfully by the leading men of the Council. Their lives would be in danger, they said, if the King should get the upper-hand and secure the government of the realm, at which he was aiming. This would also be the Queen's ruin, whom they often blamed for having come to an understanding with her husband, she having convinced him that he was putting a knife not only to her throat but to his own.

The King's body was blown into the garden by the violence of the explosion, and a poor English chamberchild, who slept in his room, was killed. The sudden report was heard over all the town. When the Queen was told what had occurred she was in great grief, and kept her chamber all that day. The corpse was brought into full Council and there examined, in order to discover the mode of his death. Diligent inquiries were made about the crime on all sides, especially by those who were its authors, amongst others by Moray. He had absented himself on the day of the murder on the pretext that he was going to visit his wife, who, he said, was dangerously ill. This same earl, having matured all his plans for seizing the crown and ruining the Queen, asked her permission to go to France; and this she not only granted, but also gave him letters of introduction to her relatives there, with power to draw money on her dowry. Moray chiefly intrusted the laird of Grange with the execution of these designs. Grange was the tool of Moray and Lethington, and the latter of these was the chief conductor of all the plots and rebellions of the former. Moray had told several Englishmen that it was necessary to get rid of the King, not only because he was a Catholic, but also because he was an enemy to Queen Elizabeth. But there were also private feuds of an old standing between them, both before and after the marriage. The King never forgot the ambushade planned for him at Lochleven, before he married the Queen, and some other attempts which were made at a later date.

Earl Bothwell was much suspected of this villainous and detestable murder, and the impression was strengthened by the many evil reports circulated about him. He replied, by many placards and challenges, that he was ready to answer these charges and justify himself; which he ultimately did in full Parliament. If we may judge by the plots and deeds of his associates, it would seem that, after having used him first as their tool to rid themselves of the King, their next step was to

make him their instrument for the ruin of the Queen, their true and lawful sovereign.

The plan of these conspirators was this—to persuade her to marry Bothwell, so that they might charge her with being in the plot against her late husband, and with having become a consenting party to his death. This they did shortly afterwards, appealing for their proof to the fact that she had married the murderer.

This poor young princess, inexperienced in such devices, was circumvented by the persuasions, requests, and importunities of the people by whom she was influenced. If we look at the affair from a public point of view, she received requests signed by the nobles and presented in full Council. As regarded himself, she saw that Bothwell had been entirely cleared from the crime laid to his charge. Suspecting that there was nothing more than what appeared on the surface, the Queen began to give ear to their overtures, not letting it be seen, however, what would be her ultimate decision. She remained in this state of hesitation partly because of the reports which were current at the time when this marriage was proposed, partly because she was not strong enough to punish the rebels, by whom (if the truth must be told) she was rather commanded than consulted and obeyed. Their hatred became apparent at a later date, when, under the plea of punishing Bothwell, they took up arms in the open field against herself.

You shall hear presently how they acted when, in good faith and in reliance upon the public honour, she surrendered herself into their hands. She did so upon the understanding that she was to join with them in discovering and prosecuting the murderers of the late King, as they themselves had demanded. She promised that no one should interfere in this matter by favour, or, indeed in any way whatever, so as to impede justice; for the rebels had complained that until now she had been under the influence of their accusers. They also required that she should sanction the Parliament which they determined to hold. As for Bothwell, they let him escape in safety, notwithstanding all their accusations. They took no heed of him, nor did they employ any of the usual legal proceedings against him in Parliament. With regard to the Queen it was different. Their hostility was undisguised; they imprisoned her in Lochleven, under the custody of Moray's natural brother, without telling her their reasons for so doing. Their one object was the

usurpation of the crown, to attain which they resorted to those disastrous and abominable proceedings which I am now about to mention.

It happened one day that these lords and the chief of the Council of the nobility had a meeting in Bothwell's house in Edinburgh, after which they sent Lethington, the Justice Clerk, and a third to the Queen, as their delegates. Public affairs, said they, were in great disorder; and as it was necessary that they should be rectified, they had come to tell her of the course which they had decided to employ for their amendment. They had unanimously resolved to press her to take Bothwell for her husband. They knew that he was a man of decision, well adapted to rule—he was the very character needed to give weight to the resolutions and actions of the Council. All of them therefore pleaded in his favour.

To these representations and others of the same kind, the Queen gave a refusal, pure and simple. When the deputies repeated their request, she made the same answer. She reminded them of the reports which were current about the death of the King, her late husband. Lethington and the others replied that Bothwell had been legally acquitted by the Council. They who made this request to her did so for the public good, and they were the highest of the nobility; it would be for them therefore to vindicate a marriage brought about by their advice and authority. They asked her to assemble the Estates, in order that the question might be considered; and then they, the delegates, one and all, signed the request which they had presented, thereby to authenticate it, and to take on themselves the responsibility of its contents. Thus vehemently urged her Majesty.<sup>2</sup>

It must not be forgotten that Bothwell had gained over to his side all the lords of the Council, with a view to this special object. Some helped him honestly from friendship, others from fear, being in dread of their lives; others dissembled, meaning through him to carry out their own personal ends and private designs. Having thus secured the help and advice of the Council, and seeing the difficulties which would arise from delays, Bothwell resolved in some way or other, to seize the person of the Queen, and compel her to bring the matter to a conclusion. Different plans were proposed, varying according

<sup>2</sup> In the MS. the sentence ends thus abruptly.

to the intention of the proposers, but in the end it was carried out in the following manner.

As the Queen was on the road from Stirling (where she had been to visit the Prince) to Linlithgo, she was met by Bothwell at the head of 1,500 horsemen, armed according to the custom of the country. The Earl of Huntley was in attendance upon her, but at that time he was a warm partisan of Bothwell. Bothwell carried her to Dunbar Castle, which belongs to her Majesty, of which the keeper was Whitlaw. In answer to her complaints, she was reminded that she was in one of her own houses, that all her domestics were around her, that she could remain there in perfect liberty, and in the free exercise of her lawful authority. Practically, however, everything was just the opposite, for the greater part of her attendants were removed; nor had she full liberty until she had consented to the marriage which had been proposed by the lords of the Council. Shortly afterwards it was publicly celebrated in Holyrood Palace in Edinburgh, by the Bishop of Orkney. The people were admitted, and the chief of the nobility were present, all of whom gave proof that they looked on the union with great satisfaction, as a measure tending to promote the interests of the kingdom.

Before long, however, a conspiracy was formed against Bothwell, under the pretext of avenging the King's death. It may have originated in some secret feuds of a recent date among the lords, or possibly have sprung from grievances of a remoter period, which, though long hidden, at last came to the surface. It was settled that Bothwell should be accused (though wrongfully) of Darnley's murder. This was done by the advice of Secretary Lethington, with whom Bothwell was on bad terms. The Laird of Grange was induced to join this party, a very brave gentleman, and a man of good reputation. The conspirators never let him know the full depth of their infamous designs, but wiled him on under the pretexts mentioned above. They worked also upon his regard for Moray, upon whom he entirely depended, as he had already done in the rebellion, which had been got up under the name of religion, against the late Queen-mother. Others joined the plot out of jealousy of Bothwell's rapid promotion. They were the more easily led to do this because they found him anything but inclined to make himself agreeable to them, or to put himself to much trouble in order to please those with whom he

associated. This party consisted entirely of men who had formerly been rebels on the subject of religion.

The first who joined this league were Lord Hume and the Laird of Tullibarne, the latter of whom introduced the Earl of Mar, who had lately received that title from her Majesty, and to whose care she had intrusted her son, the Prince. She had also made him Keeper of Stirling Castle, confirming it in heritage to him and his heirs. To do this she had removed him from the office of Keeper of Edinburgh Castle by the advice of her Council, who considered these trusts too important to be both in the hands of one single individual. To a certain extent the Countess of Mar was the cause, a malevolent woman, and full of the spirit of revenge. The Laird of Tulliberne was her brother. Many of the lords were told that the Queen wished that the judicial inquiry into the King's death should be stopped, consequently they proceeded against Bothwell only. The Queen's defence against Huntley brought the truth to light, however. The Earl of Morton was also one of these plotters, as he was in every other treason. He entered into the quarrel because, by the advice of the Council, he had been refused one of the finest domains of the Crown. The wardship of his nephew, the Earl of Angus, had been intrusted to him as his nearest kinsman, whom he proposed to marry to one of the daughters of the Earl of Athol. Here he showed his cunning, for no sooner was the Queen in prison, than he married this nephew to the daughter of the Earl of Mar, to gain him over to his party. So he used this poor young nobleman as a fisherman uses a May fly to lure the silly fish to his destruction.

These conspirators agreed to hold a meeting in Libberton Church (about two miles from Edinburgh) on Tuesday, June 10, 1567. On the night of that day the Earl of Morton and Lord Hume arrived there. On the following day, Wednesday, they were joined by the Earl of Mar. As the others did not join them there, they decided that they would attempt to surprise the Queen and Bothwell in Borthwick Castle. They then fell back upon Edinburgh, and there began to get together all the others of their party with their followers, namely, the Earls of Morton, Athol, Mar, and Glencarne, the Lords Hume, Lindsay, Ruthven, Semple, and Sanquhar, the Lairds of Dumblane, Tulliberne, Grange, and the younger Cessford, with their retainers, amounting to four thousand good and well-trained soldiers.



Acting on their previous decision, the Lords Hume and Morton came with seven or eight hundred horsemen to besiege Borthwick, against which they discharged several volleys of musketry. They also railed at Bothwell, using many insulting expressions to provoke him to issue from the Castle, which he would have done more than once had not he been held back by his own people, who saw that the danger was too great. But at the last, he could stand it no longer, so, followed by forty or fifty good men-at-arms, he sallied out bravely. Dashing through the besiegers, he gained the open country, and began to collect his forces. On the same day, he got the Queen from Borthwick Castle, and took her to Dunbar, where she was met by the Lords Seton, Yester, and Borthwick, and by the Laids of Walkton, Bass, Ormeston, Wedderburn, Blakader, and Langton. Their united forces amounted to about four thousand men. There were also two hundred harquebusiers of the Queen's body-guard. A messenger was sent to hasten the arrival of Lord Fleming, the Hamiltons, and the Earl of Huntley, who had been summoned, but who did not arrive until it was too late.

When the Queen was in Dunbar she was advised by James Balfour (who had been appointed Keeper of Edinburgh Castle) to take the open field, and to march direct to Edinburgh, so as to meet the insurgents on the road. He assured her that they would not keep their ground for a moment, especially when they knew that he had declared against them, and would open fire upon their troops. If she did not do so, he would be compelled, he said, to come to terms with them. But he had been won over by the rebels to give this counsel.

Following the advice of this traitor (who offered himself first to the one party and then to the other), on Saturday, June 14th, she marched to Haddington, whence passing by Gladismore, she reached Seton, where she spent the night. Next morning she advanced to Carberry Hill in order of battle, where her troops posted themselves advantageously on a slight eminence. The leaders ordered the cavalry to dismount, not only because they saw that they were outnumbered by the cavalry of the enemy, but further because they feared their light-armed troopers would take to flight, it being their custom to fall back after making a few insignificant charges. They were for the most part borderers, men never drilled to keep the line in action, and who make light of all military

discipline, but who do good service as skirmishers or scouts when prompt measures are needed. The disorder into which they fell was partly occasioned by this habit of theirs. When the two armies were about to come to blows, M. du Croc, Ambassador from the King of France, who had left Edinburgh in company with the rebels, came to the Queen, and proposed various suggestions for an agreement, during which negotiation he passed several times from the one camp to the other. Pending these conferences, the soldiers, who were tired and exhausted with the heat of the day, began to disband, and dispersed themselves through the villages in quest of drink and other refreshments.

Du Croc thus contrived so to protract matters, that the Queen's troops were prevented from charging their antagonists, which they were ready to have done. Her artillery had already killed some of the enemies' horses, who were now hanging back. Just as these borderers were bravely advancing to the charge for the fourth time, certain deputies came from the enemy and demanded a conference. It was granted, and the meeting took place between the two camps.

The first question proposed on the Queen's part to the insurgents was this. They had risen against her and taken up arms: had they done so as subjects or as enemies? And what object had they in view? They answered that they had come there as the most faithful and obedient subjects of her Majesty, and that they required nothing but justice for the murder of the late King. They demanded that the Queen should be restored to perfect liberty; for they asserted that at the present time she was under the authority and control of those very individuals against whom proceedings ought to be taken. In order that this might be done, they petitioned that she would deliver up such persons as they would specify, and with whom at that very time she had associated herself. And here they named Bothwell. Further, they required that she would accompany the lords there assembled, who would reinstate her in her true position. She would thus be rescued out of the hands of men who had estranged her from her loyal friends, had shrouded themselves under her authority, and had hindered the due course of justice.

Until now the Queen was ignorant of the course which they meant to pursue, least of all that they intended to charge Bothwell with the death of the late King. Assuredly they had hitherto given no token of any such design.

Her Majesty replied that she had married the Earl of Bothwell by the advice and common consent of the principal nobility, particularly of many of those very persons who were now in arms against her; she held herself bound, therefore, to stand by him until they had proved their accusations against him. It seemed very strange to her, she said, that they had neither prosecuted the Earl nor charged him with this crime until after their marriage. Before the present time they had many opportunities of seizing him, which they could have done without the large force which they now thought necessary. She ought to have been previously informed of all this, and distinctly warned by the Council. But, on the other hand, she owed a duty to the memory of the late King, her husband, and this she would not neglect. Most willingly, therefore, would she authorize every one to inquire into the circumstances of his death: she herself intended to do so, and to punish with all severity those persons who should be convicted of the crime. She claimed, as an act of justice, the aid of all those present against the said murderers, who would be astonished to find themselves convicted. Such considerations as these moved her to intrust herself to the good faith of the nobles here assembled, for thereby she would give an authority to whatever they might do or advise. She would aid them, as was her duty, in all such-like prosecutions.

The Queen then asked for permission to speak with Lethington, who caused her to be informed that he was not one of the rebels. Next she applied to the Earl of Athol, who excused himself in like manner. At last came the Laird of Grange, with whom she discussed these matters at considerable length. She thereupon decided that she would return with the lords, hoping by this step to remove all doubts and suspicions which might be raised as to her wish to shelter or support the guilty. This she said she would do, relying upon Grange's assurance, which the lords in full Council, as he said, had warranted him to give. But before doing this she desired him to provide for the safety of Lord Bothwell, namely, that no harm should be done to him whilst he was awaiting the meeting of the Parliament, in which this matter would be settled. Grange answered that he had received no authority from the noblemen of his party to discuss any such question, and that they were already angry with him for having exceeded his powers. Hereupon he shook Bothwell by the hand, and advised him to depart, pro-

missing that as he was an honest man he would do his utmost to prevent him from being pursued.

At the first Bothwell would by no means consent to this arrangement, but was determined to fight. At the end, however, he was overcome by the Queen's entreaties, who persuaded him to keep aloof until the issue of the coming Parliament should be made known. She promised that if he were found innocent of the crime with which he was charged, as he said he was, nothing would prevent her from rendering to him all that a true and lawful wife ought to do. If he failed to do this, it would be to her an endless source of regret that by their marriage she had dimmed her own good name, and from this calamity she would endeavour to free herself by every means in her power.

Just before parting from the Queen Bothwell wished to ease his conscience and to let her know the wicked designs of her enemies. He told her that the Earl of Morton, Secretary Lethington, James Balfour, and some others, who at that moment were in arms against her, were guilty of the death of the late King, the whole having been executed by their advice and counsel. He showed her their signatures to the bond for perpetration of the deed, and told her to take good care of that paper.

Bothwell went first of all to Dunbar, then to Orkney, where he remained for some time, and at last to Denmark, where he was thrown into prison. He survived until the year 1578, and then drew up a testament, in which he gives an account of the death of the late King, a copy of which here follows.<sup>3</sup>

Her Majesty came into the enemy's camp along with her domestics, where she was welcomed by the shouts of the soldiers, who rejoiced at having recovered their Queen. Meeting the Earl of Morton, she said to him, publicly and aloud, "How is this, my Lord Morton? I am told that all this is done in order to get justice against the King's murderers. I am told also that you are one of the chief of them." He replied, "Come, let us be going; this is not the place to discuss such matters," and then slunk behind backs, as if he were not one of the nobility, never addressing himself to her Majesty.

Two very wicked men were appointed to have the Queen in charge—young Drumlanrig and young Cessford, both of them cruel murderers and men of a most scandalous life. The former

<sup>3</sup> No such document occurs in Nau's manuscript, as we now have it.

had murdered his own cousin, when he was in bed and in his wife's arms. Of this cousin he was the next heir; and because Drumlanrig could not get from him a certain inheritance at the price he wished, he killed him. The other, Cessford, had most cruelly slaughtered his own uncle, the Abbot of Kelso, who was also his godfather, because the Abbot would not give him in fief some lands which were dependent upon the said abbey. The Queen happened to see near her the elder Laird, the father, and said, "Laird of Drumlanrig, is this the promise you made me, upon your knees, when you assured me, after your first rebellion, that you would follow none but the royal standard?" He answered, "In God's Name, why have not you granted my son a pardon?" meaning for certain acts of treason and for the murder of his cousin already mentioned, whose wife became an idiot after having seen her husband butchered before her eyes.

During the journey the lords separated all her domestics from her Majesty, and caused the troops from Edinburgh to keep so close to her that none of her own party could say a word to her. She now began to understand that she was a prisoner. In this manner she was taken to Edinburgh, and placed in the house, or lodging, of the Laird of Craigmillar, near the town. He was a man of very wicked life and of no religion, who had been induced to join this faction by reason of a disappointment. The custody of Dunbar Castle had been taken from him, in exchange for which, however, he had a grant of the provostship. This fact, joined to the persuasion of Lethington—whose first wife was sister of Craigmillar's second wife—induced him to change sides. He was a man of little courage; at the end of his life (he died in Paris of the *grosse verole*, or leprosy) he was very penitent for his rebellion against her Majesty, considering not only the allegiance which he owed her as a sovereign, but the gratitude which was due to her as a benefactress.

On her arrival at Craigmillar's house she there found the lords ready to sit down to supper, who invited her to sup in their company. She told them that they had already provided her with supper enough, considering the condition to which she saw herself reduced; and that she needed repose more than food. She was then shut up in a chamber, and guards were posted on the stairs and at each door in the house. Some of the soldiers were so shameless as to refuse to leave the room; so that the Queen passed the whole night, lying on a bed,

without undressing. The utmost liberty which she could obtain was to be allowed to write a letter to the lords, more particularly to the Laird of Grange (in reliance upon whose word she had come among them), and to Secretary Lethington. With the latter she wished to discuss the troubles which confronted her, and chiefly to understand from him what the nobility meant to do. She offered to assist personally in the Parliament in furtherance of the justice which they required for the murder of the late King. She also demanded to know the grounds upon which she had been so disrespectfully treated and imprisoned, so that none of her servants could come near her. She inquired why she had not been lodged in her own castle, as hitherto had been usual. She told them that at the present time she had neither bed nor furniture befitting her rank, and that they did not conduct themselves towards her as the good and faithful subjects they professed themselves to be.

The only answer which she received was this—that fearing she might do herself a mischief in her despair they had placed guards over her, even in her bedroom. As they refused to give her the key of that room, she lay down upon the bed, dressed as she was, for about an hour and a half.

About eight or nine o'clock next morning, as the Queen was looking out of the window of her chamber, she saw Lethington pass on his way to the Council of the Lords. She called him several times by name in a piteous voice and through her tears. She reminded him of the obligations under which he lay to her, and of the many favours and kindnesses she had conferred upon him; in return for all which she asked for nothing more than that he would come and speak with her. Lethington hung down his head and made as though he had neither seen nor heard her. Several of the soldiers and others of the common people becoming riotous, the guards came to remove her from the window, telling her that possibly some one might fire at her, for which the lords would be very sorry, and they consequently forbade her to go near the window.

Her Majesty had no dinner that day, but ate only a morsel of bread and drank a glass of water. In the meantime she was much threatened and most unbecomingly addressed by Drumlanrig and Cessford. No answer having yet arrived to the letter which she had addressed on the previous evening to the Lords of the Council, she sent a second. She demanded to know the reason why she was thus detained in prison, and



why treated as she had been. She asked to speak with them, or some one of them, and to be taken to her castle, or to the palace of Holyrood, in which she could be guarded with quite as much safety and much more honourably than where she was at the present time, until they had decided what they would do with her. The only reply which she received was this, that she could have no answer that day.

During the course of the evening Lethington came to pay her Majesty a visit. He was induced to do this partly by the advice of his friends, and partly because the report of his great ingratitude had become well known through the whole town. Such was his shame and fear, that even when he was speaking to her he did not once dare to raise his eyes and look her in the face. At the beginning of the conversation she asked him to explain the cause of her present treatment, and to let her know what was yet in store for her. She reminded him of what she had done for him, how she had favoured and supported him, how she had even saved his life; all of which he admitted to be true. Then he told her that it was suspected and feared that she meant to thwart the execution of the justice demanded upon the death of the late King, and that she was held in custody until she should authorize this investigation and put all other matters into good order. He told her also that the Council would never permit her to return to Bothwell, who, he said, ought to be hanged; and until this were done there could be no peace in the kingdom, nor would the nobility trust her. Here he discoursed with something more than freedom upon Bothwell's habits, against whom he manifested an intensity of hatred.

The Queen was fully alive to Lethington's insolence and false pretences; she knew that he knew the truth much better and far more fully than he had spoken. She felt that he would urge the lords to carry out their evil designs against herself, by charging her with wishing to hinder justice being done for the murder which they themselves had committed. She knew that nothing terrified them more than the prospect of an investigation. So she answered Lethington with great calmness. She was ready, she said, to refute these accusations by joining with the lords in the inquiry which was about to be made into the murder. As to Earl Bothwell, Lethington knew—no one better—how everything had been arranged, he, more than any other person, having been the director of the scheme.

The conversation between them now glided from one point to another. The Queen saw that Lethington's object was to create a misunderstanding, thereby to support the action of the nobility; she felt herself compelled, therefore, to speak to him plainly. She told him that she feared that he, Morton, and Balfour, more than any others, hindered the inquiry into the murder, to which they were the consenting and guilty parties. The Earl of Bothwell had told her so, who swore, when he was leaving her, that he had acted entirely by their persuasion and advice, and showed her their signatures. If she, a queen, was treated as she had been, merely as one suspected of wishing to prevent the punishment of the criminals, with much greater certainty could they proceed against him—Lethington—the Earl of Morton, James Balfour, and others of the Council, who were the actual murderers. They knew the sincerity of her intention in this matter: it was pitiable to make her bear the punishment of their crime. She threatened that if he continued to act in conjunction with these noblemen and plot with them, she, who until now had supported and preserved him, would publish what Bothwell had told her about his doings.

Seeing himself thus detected, Lethington became exceedingly angry. He went so far as to say that if she did so she would drive him to greater lengths than he yet had gone, in order thereby to save his life, which (as he remarked frequently, but like a very coward) he held dearer than all else in the world. On the other hand, if she let matters tone down little by little, the day would come when he might do her some good service. At present it was necessary that he should go back to the lords, so he begged she would license him to depart and would not ask him to return to confer with her. It caused him to be suspected, and did herself no good. If his credit with the nobility were shaken, her life would be in great peril. More than once it had been proposed that she should be put out of the way; and this he could prevent.

About nine o'clock in the evening the Earl of Morton came to her Majesty with a message from the Council to the effect that they had decided that Holyrood Palace (which is outside the town) should be her place of residence. But in truth they meant speedily to remove her elsewhere; and they were afraid that if she were carried off in the sight of the people an insurrection would follow. With this intention they waited until nightfall.

When she reached her Palace of Holyrood supper was ready, and the greater part of her domestic attendants and servants were there. All were very sad to see their poor mistress in such a miserable plight in the midst of her own subjects, men whom she had advanced and favoured.

In the middle of the supper the Earl of Morton (who all the time had been standing behind the Queen's chair) asked a squire of the stable whether the horses were ready. He ordered the dishes to be removed from the table and told the Queen to prepare to mount. Partly from distress of mind, partly from the fear of being poisoned, the Queen had eaten nothing the whole day. She inquired to what place they were going to take her in such haste, and requested that some of her personal attendants and domestics might go with her. This request was absolutely refused; two *femmes de chambre* only were appointed, all the rest weeping and entreating that they might follow their mistress. The hardest heart among the most cruel barbarians would have been moved to pity at the departure of this poor Princess. Morton gave her to understand, indirectly, that she was going to visit the Prince her son; but she was taken, with every precaution, direct to Lochleven, the house of the Earl of Moray's natural brother. Moray in the meantime was in France, and a frequent visitor with the Admiral Gaspar de Coligny.

The Queen was permitted to take no other clothes than her night-dress, nor was any linen allowed her. She passed Leith, which was filled with soldiers ready to put down any insurrection among the people. Lords Lindsay and Ruthven took charge of her to Lochleven. Mary imagined that the Hamiltons and the Earl of Rothes had got together some forces for her rescue; she tried therefore to linger on the road as long as possible. This was not permitted, for some one was always near her who whipped her hackney to urge it on. At the edge of the lake she was met by the Laird and his brothers, who placed her in a room on the ground floor furnished only with the Laird's own furniture. The Queen's bed was not there, nor were the other articles proper for one of her rank. In this prison, and in the midst of such desolation, her Majesty remained for fifteen days and more, without eating, drinking, or conversing with the inmates of the house, so that many thought she would have died.

In the meantime a house steward of her Majesty, an Italian,

seduced by the rebels, handed over to them her silver plate and the other furniture which he had in charge. The same persons laid hands on all the remainder of her most valuable movables, as well from her cabinet as her chambers, especially her entire wardrobe, from which she could not obtain a chemise, or even one single dress until the return of Moray. He caused his wife's tailor to make the Queen a dress of violet cloth, which he sent to her, along with some beggarly odds and ends, for which he could find no other use.

This good gentleman, the Earl of Moray, who at that time was in France, so soon as he heard of the Queen's imprisonment, went to the King and the princes of Lorraine, her relations, and pledged himself to them by endless promises, protestations, and perjuries to set out forthwith for Scotland, and there to strain every nerve to free her from prison, to reestablish her authority, and to put everything into its former good order. This treachery in which he traded was very lucrative. But he had already mapped out in his mind all the successive acts in this tragedy, and something yet beyond it. Not satisfied with the accursed wickedness and treason already executed, (from which he imagined his absence was a sufficient discharge in the eyes of the world) he planned how the game should be played out before his return, so that he might take possession of his new kingdom without much trouble. As he did not wish it to be said that he had lawlessly usurped it during the life-time of its sovereign, it was proposed, in a meeting of his own party, that the Queen should be put to death, one way or other, after which there would be no great difficulty in disposing of her son the Prince. This project, however, was opposed by some of this confederacy, who were horrified at the idea of such a detestable crime, which would disgrace their memory and their country to all posterity. The plan therefore was changed. Formerly they had said that after what they had already done there was no safety for them except in the Queen's death, for she might on some future occasion have it in her power to punish them; but now they decided that they would compel her to resign the crown and transmit it, as of her own free will, to her son, the Prince. Thus they began to use his name against his poor mother, as they had already employed the memory of his father and some others against herself, meaning to benefit themselves by the common ruin of the whole family. But be that as it may,

I have been assured that the intention of this monster of ingratitude was first to deprive her Majesty of her crown, and then of her life. He did not dare openly to propose the Queen's death in the Parliament which had assembled (for at that time Lethington, Grange, and many others had acknowledged their first faults and were endeavouring to amend them), but with the same design he asked the Parliament to let him settle the question of her custody, so that he might make such arrangements as to him should seem fitting. This however was absolutely refused.

On his return from France Moray went to visit the Queen at Lochleven, where he found her in a lamentable plight. As she was now nearly twenty-five years old she still had it in her power to revoke the many gifts of the best domains of the crown which she had made to a large number of the conspirators. Here was an additional reason for hurrying on the resignation already mentioned. A resolution on the subject was arrived at in a meeting of the nobles, and the letters were prepared by Lethington, a man who always liked to have two strings to his bow. Lethington drew them in a form which was to the Queen's advantage, and they contained conditions which made them worthless whenever she pleased.

The lords having come to this decision, the Earl of Athol, Lethington, and the Laird of Tulibardine despatched an equerry named Robert Melvil to tell the Queen that ere long these letters would be presented to her for her signature. They entreated her not to refuse. They warned her that if she did not sign them her life would be in danger, and that her enemies would seek her destruction by every means in their power, for they dreaded that she would take vengeance on their misdeeds. As for themselves, they were unable, they said, to hinder such doings. Nothing could be done until the return of Moray, with whom, however, they might find some way of cancelling the resignation. The only effect of this document would be to protract the time, and thereby give the opportunity of bringing things back into good order.

In confirmation of all this, and in accordance with the custom of the country, the Earl of Athol sent the Queen a turquoise which he formerly had received from herself. Lethington sent her a small oval ornament of gold, on which was enamelled Æsop's fable of the "Lion in the Net," which is being gnawed by a mouse, with these words in Italian written

round it—*A chi basta l'animo, non mancano le forze*. The Queen's cipher was engraven within the lid, which had a cord of violet silk and gold. Some Italian verses in a paper were inclosed. Tullibarne reminded her of a certain password, which had been agreed upon between her Majesty and himself.

Nau, as we see, was fully impressed with the conviction that the life of Mary was in danger during the earlier portion of her abode at Lochleven. Ruthven and Lindsey, as described by him, were capable of carrying out any scheme of violence which might be thought necessary by the nobles at Edinburgh. But, it may be said, Nau exaggerated the peril of the Queen's situation; he seeks to excite our sympathy by multiplying the horrors of the prison-house. Let us hear what Throgmorton, Elizabeth's ambassador at this time in Scotland, has to say upon the subject. He knew the feelings of his mistress in regard to Moray and in regard to Mary; he was not likely to calumniate the designs of the former nor to sympathize too deeply with the difficulties of the latter. Writing to Elizabeth on July 16th, he tells her plainly that Mary is in fear of her life. On the 21st of the same month he repeats his assertion. "It is feared," says he, "that for their security that have so far waded, as they have deprived her of authority, so they will shortly of life." Ten days afterwards Mary's situation was equally hazardous. Throgmorton writes thus to Cecil: "It is to be feared this tragedy will end in this Queen's person after this coronation (of her son), as it began in David Rizzio's person, and after in her husband's."

In our next chapter Nau shall resume the subject, and from him we shall learn something more of the position of Mary Stuart while within the walls of Lochleven.

JOSEPH STEVENSON.



### *The Netherlands from 1555 to 1567.*

---

IN the royal and imperial diadems which, at his abdication, on October 25th, 1555, the Emperor Charles the Fifth cast aside ere retiring to his retreat in the monastery at Yuste, the fairest jewel was the Netherlands. Nevertheless, to his son and successor, Philip the Second, King of Spain, that jewel proved a costly gift, to keep and guard which caused him ceaseless cares, the wealth of the Indies and the blood of the best and bravest of his soldiers. Rightly to understand how these things came to pass, it is needful to survey for a moment the state of Western Europe and the situation of the Netherlands at the commencement of the second half of the sixteenth century, and to examine briefly the causes and beginnings of the troubles of the Netherlands under Philip the Second.

When this century had reached its middle, religious unity had been entirely destroyed in the northern and western countries of Europe. The Scandinavian States were wholly Lutheran. Protestant princes held power over the greater part of Northern Germany. Even in the hereditary states of the House of Austria, the Emperors found their authority enfeebled by a nobility deeply infected by heresy. The doctrines of false reformers had divided Switzerland. England, for a too brief time restored to her old faith under Mary Tudor, was soon again enslaved by a State religion under Queen Elizabeth, while in Scotland the partisans of new doctrines were strenuously asserting their supremacy. France was still, as a whole, true to the religion which had made her so fair, although even she had been tainted by heresy, which under a succession of feeble sovereigns, was destined to dim her glory and to weaken her position for a time in Europe. The two westernmost peninsulas of southern Europe were almost free from heretical influences. The cold Protestantism of the north, with its bare churches and cheerless ceremonies, could not thrive in the sunshine of the South with a Catholic population as warm in their

faith as the clime in which it dwelt. The chill north wind can kill the olive and destroy the vine; it cannot replace them by the coarse products of the lands whence it blows. So can the blast of Protestantism blight the faith of the South. It cannot plant itself there. It can only leave behind it the bareness of infidelity. Even this it did not succeed in doing in the sixteenth century. Nowhere, however, while thus endeavouring to destroy the fair fabric of Christendom, was heresy able to establish its strongholds without much bloodshed and many fierce contests. Often such contests assumed purely political aspects, yet at bottom, the religious question was that which called for settlement, and hence history has rightly named these contests wars of religion. Whether it was, as in Scotland, the English or French influences, the royal or the aristocratic and popular elements which contended for mastery; whether, as in France, Guise or Bourbon strove for sovereignty; whether, as in the Low Countries, the native battled with the foreigner; the real point at issue was the same everywhere. Was the new and false religion to prevail, or was the old and true faith to hold its own? To answer this question, the two great contending powers, of good and of evil, brought into the field forces of stupendous magnitude and of varied kinds, some of which were as yet little known in Europe. On the side of the so-called reformers, material aid came from Germany and from England. In the former country, petty princes sought to become, with the help of the reformers, powerful potentates; in the latter country, the astute Elizabeth saw that to combat Spain by aiding heretics wherever they were to be found was the surest way to erect her empire, and to win for England supremacy on the seas. The weakness of the Holy Empire, and the power of the Turk also were of no little service to the enemies of the faith. The Catholic Church, on her side, could bring physical force to defend her cause. The two powers which took up arms in her defence were France and Spain. The vacillating and weak characters of her sovereigns of the House of Valois soon rendered the aid of France valueless. Spain, under Philip the Second, remained throughout a steadfast ally. To Philip this was due. At the very outset of his reign, this King made it his chief aim to preserve the faith in his vast dominions. Dynastic motives might seem now and again the mainspring of his actions. His choice of means may now and again shock the pretended delicacy of conscience of

the men of our age, and make them doubt for a time whether a monarch so unscrupulous on some occasions, could really be a faithful defender of God's Church. Nevertheless, if Philip's career be looked at as a whole, there is not reason to doubt that the goal at which his policy aimed was the preservation of the faith. The determination of character with which he persisted in his desire to reach that goal was occasionally eclipsed by a curious display of vacillation as to the means to be used for compassing his end. That Philip had this great end always in view is his justification in the eyes of all impartial judges and his condemnation in the eyes of the sectaries whose projects he baffled and foiled.

The contest that was thus being fought between God's Church and her foes was one that could not be carried on by physical force alone. Moral forces more terrible and more deadly than armed hosts rushed into the fray. The invention of the printing press had given to the world a powerful engine of war. Like nearly all new instruments for warlike purposes, it lent its aid to combatants on all sides, and it would be hard to say whether it has favoured most the cause of evil or the cause of God. The reproduction by means of the printing press, of the writings of the Fathers, of the Doctors, and of the theologians of the Church, so that the humblest village priest can have them within his reach; the dissemination of millions of bishops' pastorals, of books of prayer and devotion; the spreading broadcast over the world of myriads of catechisms; these are some of the results—in every way glorious—of the printing press. On the other hand, immoral and irreligious works have also issued from the press, yet it seems hardly credible that the evil done by them, and which would in part at least have been done without them, has not been more than counter-balanced by the good done by the printing press. Be this as it may, the printing press was, during the sixteenth century, a mighty machine for attack and defence in the wars of religion. A discovery, which should have been for good only, in this century showed its ill effects. When the saintly Columbus gave to Castile and Leon a new world, he little thought of the evils his discovery was about to introduce into Europe. The adventurers who sailed in his wake had not the same noble aim that he had. They faced the dangers of the deep, they ventured into unexplored seas, they doubled the two great capes of the Antipodes, in order, not to spread the light of

the faith, but to fill their coffers with gold, which they sent back to the Old World, to minister to passions and pleasures that had hitherto been more or less restrained. Gold was thus lavished to corrupt the heart, in order that the intellect might more easily be led astray by deceitful doctrines. In saying this, however, it must not be thought that the mighty discovery of Columbus was all for evil. Could Columbus have foreseen the woes of both Old and New Worlds which were to follow on his discovery, he would not have locked in his bosom for ever the great idea he had so providentially conceived. He would have seen too the great future which has already begun in the New World by the progress that Catholicity is now making there. Nor must even the past be left out of the reckoning. Millions in the East and West, in India, China, Japan, and the two Americas have received the blessing of faith by the instrumentality of the great Genoese. Still, the fact remains, that in the middle of the sixteenth century his discovery had momentarily ill-effects on the Old World. Another cause militating in favour of heresy was the discontent of a large number of nobles, who, in the stirring times of Charles the Fifth, had had active employment in camps and courts, although it was often to the detriment of their estates. These men, as well as a very large number of soldiers of fortune, were ready to welcome any novelty and any change that was likely to mend their fortunes or give occupation to their swords. In them the fighting propensities of the ages of chivalry had outlived the feelings of honour and of religion that had animated the knights of earlier days.

In opposition to these forces, besides the material help of Spain, the Catholic Church had on her side moral forces on which she has ever relied and never relied in vain. The Council of Trent had done its great work and its decrees were now being published throughout the Catholic world, and were to restore, wherever they had been marred, order and discipline in the fold. As at all the epochs when the Church has been severely tried, she has been helped by a number of great saints, so, in this later time of tribulation she was aided by a whole host of holy men. Of these one had founded an Order which was destined to defend the faith wherever it was menaced, to replant it wherever it was uprooted, to sow its seeds wherever the virgin soil was found to receive it. This founder was St. Ignatius of Loyola, and this Order was the famous Society

of Jesus. "All the publications," remarks Baron Hubner, "all the private letters, all the diplomatic correspondence of the times are full of this newly-born Order, showing, some by their high praises, others by their censures and insults, the large share it had in regenerating the Catholic world." Of the Roman Pontiffs who reigned during the struggles of the second half of the sixteenth century, all were capable, and some were as learned, and some as energetic and as holy men as ever sat in the Chair of Peter. Three in succession were most remarkable Pontiffs: Pius the Fifth was a Saint; Gregory the Thirteenth has connected his name for ever with one of the greatest scientific reforms the world has ever seen, that of the Calendar; while Sixtus the Fifth had such force of character that his short reign of five years will be ever remembered.

Such, in its outline, was the state of Western Europe when Philip received from his father's hands the Spanish crown with its possessions in the Netherlands. It is time now to look at the situation of those provinces when Europe was in the condition which we have sketched above.

The Netherlands when they came under the rule of Philip the Second, comprised seventeen provinces, of which the greater portion is now included in the modern kingdoms of Belgium and Holland. Some portions of them have, however, been absorbed by France and Germany, while on the other hand modern Belgium includes the old principality of the Bishops of Liège within its limits—a principality over which the Spanish monarch had no sovereign rights. Strictly speaking, Philip was not King of the Netherlands, and only ruled over them by titles derived from their component provinces. He ruled Flanders as its Count, and he was no more in Artois, Hainault, and four other provinces; in the province of Mechlin and in four others he was only lord; Antwerp was but a marquisate, while Brabant, Limburg, Luxemburg, and Guelders gave him the title of duke. These provinces, although they had much degenerated in their material prosperity since the last century, were still among the wealthiest of Philip's possessions. It was estimated that they contributed in money to the enterprises of the Emperor Charles, more than he derived from his colonies. It was said, too, that the taxation of the Netherlands yielded him a larger yearly revenue than the whole of England afforded to Henry the Eighth, in the early years of that monarch's reign.

The great prosperity of Flanders had indeed declined ever since the time when the burghers of Bruges imprisoned a King of the Romans. That city was rapidly becoming what it to-day is, a tomb for its past grandeur. Its splendid civic edifices still attested its ancient municipal power. From its stately belfry, the bell still rang which called its countless population of skilful artisans to and from their labours, but to the sonorous sound there was no returning sound of tramping feet. Solitary were the grass-grown streets, deserted were the once busy quays, departed were the merchants from its once crowded exchanges. Political events had had some share in ruining the Venice of the north, while the shifting sands of the ocean by silting up her only estuary had deprived Bruges of her once extensive commerce. The foreign merchants and the representatives of the Hanseatic League left the city and established their counting houses to the number of a thousand at Antwerp. This city, for a few years became the centre of the commercial activity of the Netherlands. Thousands of heavily laden waggons passed in and out of its gates carrying or fetching cargoes for the vessels which sometimes were counted by thousands in the Scheldt. The population of the place was reckoned at upwards of two hundred thousand about the middle of the sixteenth century, while Ghent and Liège each contained over a hundred thousand souls. Brussels which had of late become the seat of government, could already count a thriving population of nearly eighty thousand. John Stratius, a printer of Lyons, who in 1584 compiled an account of the troubles of the Low Countries, gives this description of them: "The country," he says, "is rich, fertile, and thickly peopled . . . besides what the land produces, a great quantity of all kinds of goods is brought to it, so that many strange nations find there all they want, and handy because of the sea, harbours, or streams near almost all the chief cities. It is truly the most populous, rich, architecturally beautiful, pleasantest and most commodious country in Europe." The seventeen provinces contained 208 walled cities, 150 open towns, and 6,300 villages. having each their church, while smaller villages and hamlets abounded. Agriculture had attained a high state of perfection, while the arts and trades of peace flourished in the cities, and the sturdy seamen of the Netherlands pushed the commerce of their country, as Strada remarks, to the furthest limits of the known world. The principal industry of the country



was weaving—an industry which was destined to transfer its site to England during the troublous times at hand. Iron manufactures at Liège had already assumed some importance. In fine arts, music and painting were much cultivated, and the latter was still to produce the gems of the Dutch masters and the works of Rubens and Vandyck.

The people of the Low Countries whether Flemings or Walloons were reputed brave soldiers and liberty-loving citizens. They were jealous of their privileges. These had been by no means so curtailed by the efforts of the Burgundian princes as some writers seem to imagine. In the cities the population was ruled by its own magistrates, and made its own laws and preserved its old customs. In the provinces, the stadtholder or governor who represented the central government was, at this period, in almost every case, a nobleman who by birth or by interest, was a fellow-countryman of those over whom he ruled. The estates of each province, too, and the estates-general, were alone invested with authority to settle the subsidies that should be accorded to the prince or his representatives. Although these estates were not so representative as our modern parliaments, in that they were not delegated by a miscellaneous body of electors, and were rather the envoys of the nobility, of the clergy, and of the people, and had their powers very limited by their mandatories, still they contrived whenever they met, to represent very well the grievances of the nation, and to make it a hard task for the prince to untie the national purse-strings. Such, in its main features, is the picture of the Netherlands before the beginning of their troubles. The picture, however, would not be complete if we did not mention here the causes already at work which produced those troubles, or augmented them.

To understand aright the circumstances amidst which, with more or less outward signs, these causes were at work, it is well to recapitulate shortly the events which happened after the abdication of the Emperor Charles the Fifth at Brussels, on October 25, 1555, and before the departure of Philip for Spain. The truce of Vaucelles concluded with France for five years, in 1556, seemed to promise Philip a time of repose. This was rudely broken by Henry the Second, in January of the following year when his armies simultaneously entered Italy and the Netherlands. Philip, thereupon, took the offensive, and an army under Philibert of Savoy, governor-

general of the Netherlands, appeared before St. Quentin. The Constable of France, Montmorency, trying to relieve the place, was attacked by the young Count Egmont. The French were beaten with the loss of four thousand killed. A hundred flags, eighteen cannon, and the Constable himself fell into the hands of the conquerors. The dismay was general in France, but Philip, always slow, lost his opportunity and failed to win the fruits of victory. The Duke de Guise came up with his army from Italy, surprised Calais, and was advancing on the Lower Countries when he was met near Gravelines, on July 13, 1558, by the conqueror of St. Quentin and was totally defeated. A peace was then concluded between France, Spain, and England, at Câteau-Cambrésis, on April 3, 1559. Six months earlier by the death of Queen Mary, Philip had become a widower and Elizabeth had ascended the throne of England. The King now began the preparations for his departure. He first organized the government which was to direct affairs in the Low Countries when he had quitted them. Margaret of Parma was appointed Regent. She was, in all important matters, to act on the advice of a consulta or secret council composed of Granvelle, then Bishop of Arras, of Viglius a native of Friesland, well versed in legal affairs, and Count Charles de Berlaymont, a noble skilful in financial matters. These three, with William of Orange, Egmont, and another unimportant personage formed the Council of State, of which Viglius was President. The King also named governors to the various provinces. He held at Ghent a Chapter of the Golden Fleece, its twenty-third and last public gathering. After this, in the same city, on August 7, 1559, he met the States-General. They granted the King the subsidies he demanded, but accompanied their votes by a request that all foreigners should be removed from the Council of States—thereby meaning Granvelle—and that the Spanish troops should be at once withdrawn. With these demands the King was much vexed. Dissembling his wrath, however, he promised as regarded the troops that on the earliest occasion they should be sent to their home. A few days later, Philip with his suite embarked on board a magnificent fleet at Flushing, and left the shores of those provinces which were to be for so many years the objects of his thoughts, although he was destined never to see them again (August 25, 1559).

Seven causes may be assigned to the troubles of the Nether-

lands. Of these two only were the efficient causes of the revolt, the remaining five being rather pretexts than causes. The first grievance was that the King had confided to foreigners important posts in the government of the country. Was this true? Not altogether. Orange, Mansfeld, and Granvelle were the three most prominent foreigners exercising authority in the State. All three, however—the two first by their landed estates in the country, and the third by his episcopal functions—might be looked upon as naturalized. This first grievance was, in truth, more apparent than real. It was urged by those who wished to drive from the country the Bishop of Arras, who was the great obstacle in the way of their disloyal designs. Anthony Perrenot Granvelle was born near Besançon, August 20, 1517, of an honourable family, ennobled by Charles the Fifth for the services Anthony's father had rendered to that Emperor. Granvelle studied at the Universities of Padua and Louvain, where he became well versed in Latin and Greek languages. French, his mother-tongue, he spoke and wrote with great elegance, as well as Spanish, Italian, Flemish, and German. He embraced an ecclesiastical career, and when barely twenty-four years of age was, at the instance of the Emperor Charles, made Bishop of Arras by Pope Paul the Third. The Emperor sent him to the Council of Trent as his Ambassador. On the death of his father in 1550, the seals of the empire were given to the Bishop. Philip the Second, after his father's abdication, continued to favour Granvelle, and intrusted to him, as has been mentioned, an important post in the Consulta, and made him, as it were, the Prime Minister of Margaret of Parma. Loyal to the King as he was, perhaps, as Prescott has remarked, his accommodating character, had he been left to follow a policy of his own, might have led to different results. But he had his orders to carry out. Philip's unbending, harsh policy was not made more pleasing to the people by Granvelle's love of parade. He was, nevertheless, one of the most industrious ministers a King ever had. Often he might be seen at work with five secretaries, dictating to them at once despatches in five different tongues. As a statesman, a writer whose impartiality in such a matter is above suspicion, thus describes him: "Charles the Fifth formed a council of doctors and lawyers, composed of Sicilians, Lombards, Flemings, Burgundians, and Spaniards, presided over by the Bishop of Arras, who was destined to become one of the cleverest statesmen of his times."<sup>1</sup> The enemies of Catholic

<sup>1</sup> Mignet's *Charles-Quint*, &c., p. 17.

Spain have, down to our times, sought too often to blacken this great statesman's character, and he has suffered as much from posterity as he did from his contemporaries. "His own age," as the Catholic historian De Gerlache remarks, "misunderstood him, because he lived amidst a furious whirl of political passions, against which it was his duty to fight."<sup>2</sup> Happily, the publication of many important historical documents during recent years has done much to restore to Granvelle his fair fame. The archivist of the Belgian kingdom—no mean authority—cites many authorities to show that Granvelle was an upright and able statesman.<sup>3</sup> And this was the man, to oust whom the first grievance above mentioned was invented.

The second grievance was that a small body of Spanish troops, three thousand in number, still remained in the provinces. The presence of these troops no doubt was a burden to those among whom they were quartered, for the soldiery of the sixteenth century were nowhere welcome, owing to their licentious and lawless conduct towards the civil population. Still, the danger of a fanatical outbreak on the part of the partisans of the so-called reformers, and even the chance of fresh complications, would have amply justified Philip in keeping these veterans in the Netherlands. This he did not do, for as soon as he could pay them their arrears of pay and find shipping to take them to Spain, he sent them home at once. Thus this grievance, made much of at the time, was in reality no direct cause of the troubles.

The third cause alleged was the King's own character. No doubt Philip's love for Spain and for all that was Spanish, together with his grave and haughty Spanish demeanour, contrasted unfavourably with the frank, hearty manners of his father, in the eyes of the Netherlands. Moreover, Charles loved his Flemings, Philip disliked them; Charles filled his council-chamber with them, Philip gave them no share in the government of his empire; Charles filled the highest offices in the Church, in the State, and in the army with them, Philip grudgingly allowed them only a few posts in their own country. Under Charles the Flemings had been the spoil children of fortune. Disliked and distrusted by Philip, their discontent was

<sup>2</sup> Gerlache, *Histoire du royaume des Pays-Bas*, vol. i.

<sup>3</sup> See Gachard, in the *Bulletins de la commission royale d'histoire*, 1st series, vol. ii. p. 310, and Weiss, in the *Biographie universelle*, and in the *Papiers d'Etat de Granvelle*.

great, and soon ripened into hatred. Certainly, in this way the King's suspicious, gloomy character was a greater cause of the troubles than was the much talked of Inquisition. "The Inquisition which claims St. Dominic as its founder had long ago been established in the Low Countries, but had always been a purely religious institution. The Provosts of the Canons Regular of Ypres and of the Val des Ecoliers at Mons and the Dean of Louvain exercised the unimportant functions of inquisitors in Flanders, Hainault, and Brabant. The Inquisition only began to change its character when Luther, beginning to mingle politics with religion, preached rebellion as the final aim of heresy. In 1522 Charles the Fifth ordered the President of the Grand Council of Mechlin and a member of the Council of Brabant to ferret out, as inquisitors, persons guilty of heresy; but Clement the Seventh protested against this office being confided to laymen, whereby it would cease to be religious, and would become political. The authority of the inquisitors was re-established, and in 1537, two theologians of Louvain were created by Pope Paul the Third, Inquisitors-General for the Low Countries. It was pretended that Philip the Second wished to revive his father's scheme, and to introduce into the midst of the provinces the Spanish Inquisition."<sup>4</sup> Thus a recent Catholic historian briefly relates, and in relating explains this matter of the Inquisition. There was nothing new and nothing very formidable<sup>5</sup> about the affair; but the establishment of new bishoprics was made, in the eyes of the people, to appear a prelude to Philip's introduction of the hated Spanish Holy Office.<sup>6</sup> As a fifth cause alleged for the troubles, the erection of the new sees is worthy of some attention.

The system of ecclesiastical government—a relic of the past—had become wholly insufficient to meet the needs of the age. Efforts to better the system had been made as early as

<sup>4</sup> Kervyn, *la Flandre pendant les trois derniers siècles*, p. 99.

<sup>5</sup> When the States-General met in 1558, the deputies from Holland and Iceland prayed the King to restrain the authority of the Inquisitors within the limits set by canon law. On the other hand, the representatives of several provinces affirmed that when they found *aucuns excès en l'office de l'inquisition et que les inquisiteurs auraient travaillé aucuns contre raison, que lors ils pourveyeraient de convenable remède comme il appartiendrait*. Consult the *Bulletins de la commission royale d'histoire*, vol. viii. 3rd series.

<sup>6</sup> "By the ill-will with which some, for their ambitious purposes, never cease proclaiming that the new bishoprics have this end in view, it is impossible to make the common people think otherwise" (Granville, in the *Papiers d'Etat*, vi. 18, and elsewhere).

the first quarter of the fourteenth century. Charles the Fifth had renewed these efforts, which he was unable to make fruitful, his attention being wholly absorbed in the wars he had to wage. It was reserved for Philip the Second to carry out this "politic, wise measure, needed for the welfare of religion and the spiritual wants of the people."<sup>7</sup> The Bishops were too few in number, and their dioceses too large in extent, to permit of their performing their pastoral functions with efficiency. Both their Metropolitans lived outside the Spanish dominions, the one at Rheims, the other at Cologne. Both failed in their canonical duties towards their suffragans. It was often difficult in ecclesiastical causes to carry, out of Spanish territory, an appeal to them. It often chanced, too, that those deputed to represent them in that territory, acted, often without instructions, in a manner derogatory to the dignity of its Sovereign and injurious to the rights of its population. The insufficiency of the system of Church government encouraged abuses, allowed discipline to become relaxed, both among seculars and regulars, and of course made the progress of heresy easy. Seeing this sad state of things, the King sent the learned Sonnius<sup>8</sup> to Rome, to obtain the erection of new bishoprics, under intra-territorial metropolitan sees, in the Low Countries. The King also sent letters to several influential persons about the Papal Court, among others to the future saint, Cardinal Charles Borromeo, begging them to use their influence to forward the matter. It has been said that the Holy See was eager to thrust new bishops on the Netherlands. The Acts of Doctor Sonnius attest the falsity of this statement. Rome, in this as in all similar matters, acted with her wonted caution and deliberation. A commission of learned Cardinals sifted the matter, with a slow earnestness which even the Roman dog-days, as Sonnius testifies, could not quicken or relax. At last the report was laid before Pope Paul the Fourth; the Bull *Super universi orbis Ecclesias* was drawn up, accepted by His Holiness on May 12th, and signed and sealed with the Fisherman's Ring on July 31st, 1559.<sup>9</sup> It erected three metropolitan sees, one at Mechlin, one at Cambrai, and the third at Utrecht, having under them fifteen suffragan bishops. The jurisdiction of the Bishop of Liège was

<sup>7</sup> Gachard, *Correspondance de Philippe II.*, &c., vol. i. p. 93.

<sup>8</sup> See the Acts of Sonnius, published by Foppens in the third volume of the *Supplément à la collection des diplômes belgiques* (Brussels, 1734), and also the letters of Sonnius to Viglius, edited by the late Mgr. de Ram.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*



restrained to the limits of his principality, while the jurisdiction of the ancient metropolitans, and also of several French and German abbots in the Netherlands, was taken from them. Luxemburg, however, was left to be governed by the several foreign bishops who held jurisdiction over portions of it. The Constitutions of Pius the Fourth soon afterwards completed and defined the provisions of the Bull. The execution of the Bull met with great difficulties. The possessors of the ancient sees, not liking their jurisdiction to be curtailed, opposed it. The regular clergy opposed it, because they did not like that some of their richest monasteries should be placed immediately under the bishops, in order that these as abbots might employ a portion of the immense revenues to support their episcopal dignity. The nobility opposed it, because it ordered that in future none should be eligible to become bishops who were not graduates, or at least licentiates in theology. Some of the nobility who had held, and others who aspired to hold bishoprics, lacked this qualification. And lastly, the States of Brabant opposed it bitterly, for they did not wish to see new members, such as the new bishops would be, introduced into their Order. The States even went so far as to appeal to foreign authorities and to undoubted heretics for opinions against the Bull. On the other hand, the Doctors of the University of Louvain—with two exceptions—and the graduates supported the Bull strenuously. They made clear, in a masterly manner, that the Bull in no wise contravened the Joyous Entry of Brabant, which the King had sworn to observe. Such was the measure which undoubtedly was destined in the long run to do more to preserve the Catholic faith in the Spanish Netherlands than did the armies of Spain. Still, as it was a measure artfully represented to the people as one destined to destroy their liberties, to the nobility as one intended to curtail their privileges, and to the clergy as one aimed at their immunities and revenues, it served innocently to promote the troubles of the times.

The two remaining causes to be enumerated were, undoubtedly, the efficient causes of the years of troubles and strife which were in store for a land which God had made so fair and blessed with so many natural advantages, and which man had embellished by the labour of his brain and the toil of his hands. As the course of events will sufficiently illustrate these two causes, it suffices merely to mention them here. One

was the terrible progress of heresy. It filtered into the Low Countries on all sides as easily as the drops of a summer shower are soaked in by the sandy soil of those lands. The continual coming and going of the nobility of the Netherlands and Germany, whose members often held large estates in both countries, made easy the entrance of heresy on that side. On the north, false doctrine arrived with every cargo of grain and every shipload of timber from the Scandinavian and Baltic ports. Along the southern frontier heresy glided in stealthily, yet constantly, through the glades of the forests of the Ardennes. To the coast it came with the return of every vessel that had taken Flemish produce to England. The sailors came tainted by heresy from parts where, not seldom, even in the reign of Charles the Fifth, they were forced to be present at heretical services. The progress of heresy was also greatly favoured by the discontent of the nobles, which was the seventh and certainly the greatest of the causes at work in producing the troubles. The higher ranks of the nobility had lost that loyalty to the Sovereign which had so distinguished them in the reign of Charles, and had become anxious to place all power in their own hands. Their services, too, in the wars carried on by the late Emperor, had impoverished even the wealthiest among them. It was costly work in those times to serve one's Sovereign. William the Silent, as commander-in-chief of the Emperor's troops on the northern frontier of France, complained that he was spending more than eight times what he received. Add to this the love of display, the increase of luxuries, the expensive dress, the lavish banquets, and a too generous hospitality, and it is easy to understand how the largest estates were the prey of usurers and how the largest fortunes were unable to bear the strain imposed on them. All classes, the richest and noblest not excepted, seem to have been as much addicted to drink as the men of the present day, even if not more. If among the members of the Venetian Senate there was a Sir Wilfrid Lawson, he must have been greatly disedified on reading the reports of the representative of Venice in the Netherlands about the drinking powers of the nobles. Drinking to excess, naively remarked the envoy, was a habit they had learned from the German who, if he found himself sober by accident, believed himself to be ill! The Venetian goes on to say of the nobles of the Low Countries, that the gentlemen were intoxicated every day of their lives, and the ladies also,

although less grievously than the men.<sup>10</sup> The nobles of lesser rank vied with those above them in this reckless manner of living, with the inevitable result that their fortunes were irreparably ruined. Thus the discontent of the nobility became general. It found expression at length in a systematic opposition to the Government, which the nobles sought to embarrass, if not to overthrow, in order that, amidst changes in the State, they might win a prize from fortune which would rescue them from their difficulties. The opposition of the nobility and the progress of heresy thus became the salient features of a picture of the Netherlands during the Regency of Margaret, Duchess of Parma, and daughter of Charles the Fifth.

Could a painter place on one canvas a series of historical episodes, so that the beholder might look upon them all at the same time, no more fitting series could be chosen than those which occurred in the Low Countries during Margaret's regency. In the centre of this imaginary picture, a Doré, or one greater than he, would have to place the Regent, a woman with much of her father's character, pious, somewhat masculine in appearance and in temperament, not wanting in abilities, fearless, loving the Netherlands as her fellow-countrymen and Philip the Second as a brother to whom she owed much, yet withal a woman, compelled by her position to urge war against forces the most terrible the world knows—the forces of religious and civil rebellion. Behind her, in the background, in a cabinet of one of his Spanish residences, would be seen Philip the Second, alone, gloomy and dark, wounded in his natural affections as few fathers and husbands have ever been, finding in religion his only solace, planning mighty schemes for the defence of that religion, yet sluggish and slow in action, hampered in all he did by want of money, still ever moving onwards to the goal he had in view, obstinate in all he projected, distrustful of all around him, so that what he did oftener pleased his foes than his friends. Grouped around the Regent would appear her friends—the able Granvelle and the aged Viglius; and her enemies—the astute William of Orange and the misguided chivalrous Egmont and the sad Count Horn. The picture would be filled in with portraits of the discontented nobility, headed by Louis of Nassau and the buffoon Brederode, and cunningly directed by the wily Marnix St. Aldegonde. Beside these drinking, bragging, bullying, and petitioning nobles, would be placed ranting reformers, deluded

<sup>10</sup> See Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, vol. i. pp. 129, 130.

psalm-singing men, women, and children, their fancy fired by fears of imaginary Inquisitors, until in the heat of their fanaticism they break into the wild excesses whence they have taken their name of Image-Breakers. And to make the picture yet more weird, the painter would throw in some little scenes of quiet home life; artisans busily working in the great cities; cornfields ripening for the harvest that for many a field was never to come; students in the old University of Louvain and in the new one at Douay, among them the learned Lessius, peacefully poring over their books, while behind, and overshadowing all, would be felt rather than seen, the advancing figure of the avenging Alva. Such would be a true picture, could it be painted, of the situation of the Netherlands during the regency of Margaret of Parma. It would give a more complete idea of the times than could any detailed narrative even by the ablest of historians, for he would have to detail one by one a succession of events, which to be judged rightly must be looked at as a connected whole.

The narrative of the regency of Margaret runs on in a double stream. The two streams flow side by side, powerfully attracting onwards one the other. The one stream was the agitation of the partisans of the reform, the other the opposition of the nobles to Spain. The opposition of the aristocracy first engages our attention. It was the first to enter into action, and began when William the Silent broke with Granvelle, already Cardinal and Archbishop of Mechlin, in 1561. The aim of the opposition at first was, with most of its members, not to bring about a change of the dynasty, but only to obtain unlimited power in the Low Countries. This, as late as 1563, was Granvelle's opinion, except as regarded some of the leaders, among whom he did not place Egmont.<sup>11</sup> Besides these, to appear at the proper time on the scene, were the revolutionary nobles—men ready to destroy all order and to use their arms against their lawful Sovereign to attain their end. Between these two parties stood William the Silent, too ambitious to be satisfied with the aims of the first, too astute to join the second, ready, as Strada somewhere remarks, after having obtained the honours and the authority he coveted, by fair means or foul, to accept whatever else fortune might offer him. At present, all however were agreed on one point—and that was that Granvelle must be overthrown in order to weaken the royal authority. It

<sup>11</sup> Granvelle's *Correspondance*, vol. i.

was the Cardinal who had thwarted Orange in his desire to become Governor of Brabant; it was the Cardinal who rallied round him the few really loyal nobles, and it was the Cardinal again who prevented the States-General from being assembled. Had the latter been summoned to meet, had the loyal nobility lost its rallying-point, and had the Prince of Orange gained the post he coveted, a change profitable to the discontented nobility would easily be wrought in the Government. The Cardinal was, therefore, doomed. Pamphlets, vile and scurrilous as ever were written, caricatures, masquerades, remonstrances sent to the King, were directed against the obnoxious Minister. In vain did Granvelle, in vain Margaret, in vain all who were loyal to the King, implore the Sovereign to come in person to the Low Countries, where his presence would have silenced the disaffected and rallied around the throne those who were being misled. Philip the Second committed the folly of not listening to those who had his interests most at heart, and he made himself guilty of a still worse folly. He had the weakness to dismiss his faithful Minister. Cardinal Granvelle retired to his family estate, under pretext of a visit to his mother. The King had been the first, his Minister was the second actor who left for ever the stage on which such a terrible tragedy was about to be enacted. Yet even then they were not uninterested or influential spectators and wire-pullers in the mournful play.<sup>12</sup>

The departure of Granvelle, instead of allaying, increased, as ought to have been foreseen, the opposition of the aristocracy. Thenceforth, as Grotius remarks,<sup>13</sup> all was topsy-turvy in civil as well as in religious matters. The nobles, as Viglius, an eye-witness relates, were as joyful as boys let loose from school when they found Granvelle had gone. Those who belonged to the Council of State and had kept aloof from it while the Cardinal remained, resumed their places in the council-chamber. The unfortunate Regent now fell entirely under the influence of the Prince of Orange. The document known in history as the Compromise of the Nobles, was drawn up, circulated, and signed by the discontented among the higher classes of society. The League thus formed soon grew bolder in its attitude. The Confederates, as those who joined the League were called,

<sup>12</sup> Granvelle's departure took place March 13, 1564. On this subject, the histories of Motley, Prescott, and Strada, and the various collections of historical documents may profitably be consulted.

<sup>13</sup> Grotius, in his *Annales*, lib. i.

entered Brussels in a body, armed and on horseback, and proceeding to the Palace, presented a request to the Regent, couching their demands in civil words. As their demands were that the Regent should, on her own authority, suspend the action of the laws against heretics, and should request the King to cease enforcing them, she could only give evasive answers to the repeated demands of the Confederates. Meanwhile these latter were enjoying a series of banquets given in their honour. At one of these, which took place at Culemburg House, the Confederates, amid much noisy revelry, assumed the style and title and badges of Gueux or Beggars, which it was related that a sarcastic noble, loyal to his King, had fittingly bestowed on them. These events passed in April, 1566. In the following July, the Confederates held a meeting at St. Trond, where they assembled to the number of two thousand. On the Regent desiring to know the meaning of this gathering, they sent to her twelve of their number—nicknamed by the wits of Brussels the twelve apostles—with another request, couched in the most insolent terms. There was good reason for alarm at the progress of heresy, which, favoured or left unchecked by the nobles, now broke out into the excesses of the Image-Breakers.

The adherents of the pretended reformers had, from causes already stated, greatly increased in all parts of the country. In spite of Philip's urgent appeals to those who represented him in the Low Countries, the measures he had prescribed to check the spread of heresy were carried out slowly and unwillingly. The erection of the new bishoprics had wasted much time ere it was accomplished, and even the publication of the decrees of the Council of Trent was performed in a laggardly fashion. Both measures were of course denounced as preliminaries to the introduction of the Spanish Inquisition, yet at that very time the Inquisition, already existing in the Netherlands, was doing its work with less energy than usual, and the authorities were enforcing the edicts of Charles the Fifth with little severity. Even the Calvinist Brandt puts at seventeen only the number of those executed for heresy during the year 1564. In speaking of such executions, it should be remembered that heresy was, by the jurisprudence of the age, regarded and punished, not as a religious offence merely, but also as a crime against the State. Nevertheless, this phantom of the Spanish Inquisition was always being flashed in the eyes of the people, until, excited to fury, the mob broke into the prisons of the chief towns,



releasing both those guilty of heresy and those guilty of robberies and murders. A prompt remedy to this state of things was required, and Egmont went to Spain to implore the King to come in person to the provinces. Egmont returned satisfied with his reception at the Court. Still the King did not come. He sent despatches instead, which only caused fresh fears and discontent. Seditious pamphlets and inflammatory placards again circulated throughout the land. Public preachings were held under the walls of all the great cities, while the streets were paraded by mobs singing the psalms in the French version of Marot. So threatening did all this seem to many that at Antwerp all trade ceased for a time, and the merchants closed their offices and warehouses for fear of the mob. In face of a tumultuous populace and a disaffected nobility, the Regent was helpless. The little she could do was almost worse than useless, as it served only to alarm and irritate the public mind. She wrote to the King that she was unable to put down the public preaching, and complained that she was left unaided and unadvised to grope her way in the dark.<sup>14</sup>

The storm, so long brewing, at length burst on the eve of the Assumption, 1566, in the neighbourhood of St. Omer, where a mob of about three hundred persons broke into the churches, destroying all they could lay hands on. Ypres and the towns along the Lys, Valenciennes, Tournay, and lastly Antwerp, and thence on to the northern cities, the devastating mob of Image-Breakers made its way, marching to the sound of its own voice, intoning the hymns and psalms in French or Dutch, and gathering at the cry of "Long live the Beggars!" Prescott has given an inimitable description of the visit of the mob to Antwerp. It is too well known to need quotation here, still it is well to give that able historian's opinion as to the ravages done by the Image-Breakers. "The amount of injury done during this dismal period it is not possible to estimate. Four hundred churches," he says, "were sacked by the insurgents in Flanders alone. The damage to the Cathedral of Antwerp, including its precious contents, was said to amount to not less than 400,000 ducats! The loss occasioned by the plunder of gold and silver plate might be computed. The structures so cruelly defaced might be repaired by the skill of the architect; but who can estimate the irreparable loss occasioned by the destruction of manuscripts, statuary, and paintings? It is a

<sup>14</sup> *Correspondance de Philippe II.*, and also *Correspondance de Marguerite d'Autriche*.

melancholy fact that the earliest efforts of the Reformers were everywhere directed against those monuments of genius which had been created and cherished by the generous patronage of Catholicism. . . . The wide extent of the devastation was not more remarkable than the time in which it was accomplished. The whole work occupied less than a fortnight. It seemed as if the destroying angel had passed over the land, and at a blow consigned its noblest edifices to ruin."<sup>15</sup>

Great was the consternation at the Court of Brussels when news of this terrible outbreak reached the capital. Margaret knew not what to do, or upon whom to rely. Every hour rumours more alarming than the reality reached her ears. She summoned her Council, and found Orange ready with advice. Grant the Confederates what they demand, he said, and allow the sectaries to hold freely their public preachings, and all will be well. The latter part of the advice the Regent rejected peremptorily. Better risk the loss of the country than grant such freedom, she replied. The anxieties of the situation were too much for her, and she fell sick. Growing better, she made ready to leave Brussels secretly and seek a refuge with the loyal and Catholic Governor of Mons. She was constrained to abandon the project, and even to authorize the sectaries to hold their assemblies. Meanwhile a reaction in favour of the Government had begun in the provinces, and Margaret took advantage of it to separate herself from the Prince of Orange and his partisans. The President Viglius, with only three of the principal nobles, sided with her. On the other hand, Orange, Egmont, Horn, and two other nobles, met at Dendermonde. What passed between them is doubtful, though it is probable that Orange proposed some scheme for resisting by force the King's coming, which was now expected. Egmont, loyal at heart, refused to participate in any such proceedings, and the meeting separated. Hostilities were begun by Louis of Nassau entering the country at the head of an armed force. Margaret was however able to make head against her enemies, and by the capture of Valenciennes from the sectaries, into whose hands it had fallen, was soon able to pacify the provinces. She then called upon the Knights of the Golden Fleece, and all holding civil and military posts, to take a fresh oath of allegiance to the King. Three nobles refused to resign their appointments. Egmont and the others obeyed. Orange replied by a refusal,

<sup>15</sup> Prescott's *Philip the Second*, vol. ii. p. 33.

and added that it was his intention to leave the country, which, after a farewell interview with Egmont, he did on April 23, 1567. With him went his whole household and family except his eldest son—a lad of thirteen, studying at the University of Louvain. The departure of William, and the rumours that a royal army was about to be marched into the Low Countries, were signals for the flight of some and the submission of others. Horn submitted, and took the oath he had before refused. Egmont, no longer under the baneful influence of the Prince of Orange, was profuse in his demonstrations of loyalty. The great city of Antwerp, so lately the theatre of such terrible scenes, with its immense population, native and foreign, Catholic and Calvinist, consented to receive a garrison commanded by Count Mansfeld. The Regent presently visited the city to celebrate a *Te Deum* in thanksgiving for the re-establishment of order. All the cities of the Netherlands imitated Antwerp. Brederode attempted some resistance. His little army was dispersed, and its scattered soldiers, plundering as they went, escaped as best they could, some by sea into England, others by land into Germany. In this wise, the Regent had restored order before the arrival of the terrible Alva. Nothing now could stay his approach, for Philip, when he heard of the excesses of the Image-Breakers, had sworn that the Netherlands should rue the day when so great crimes had been wrought. The execution of what Philip had sworn was confided to Alva, than whom no sterner executioner could have been found. A wise, firm, and gentle ruler might now have prevented the renewal of troubles already allayed; the stern rule of a rude soldier was destined to rekindle the flames of rebellion which had only been smothered for a time, not extinguished for ever.

WILFRID C. ROBINSON.

*Anemone.*

CHAPTER XXXI.

OCTOBER AT FLAXHEAD.

CHARLES and Emily Westmore had been for some weeks at Flaxhead, as has already been said, before Miss Wood heard of it. Anemone immediately wrote to Emily, and learnt from her the fullest particulars that she could give as to the state of Alice. But Emily had not very much more news to give than Mr. Bellicent. The poor girl was very much upset at being forced to leave her home. She had never been away on a long visit before, and she left behind her all the little daily works in which she was most interested—her children at the schools, the old women to whom she used to go and read the Bible, the working-class for young girls, the sick at the Workhouse Infirmary, and so on. Jane Barker was quite willing to do all her work for her, but she was too fond of it herself to resign it without many a pang. It was like going away from her life. She was wrapped up in Osminster, and, besides, had no very pleasant anticipations about the new phase of existence which awaited her at Flaxhead. She knew well enough that Aunt Joanna was a romancer, and that her romances were invariably of a dark character. But, as Mr. Hornsea had said, that worthy lady had a way of making people believe her assertions when they could not correct them by any knowledge of their own, while all the time they knew that whenever such correction had been practicable, those assertions had turned out very fabulous indeed. Joanna drew for Emily just such a picture of Lady Susan's manner of living as might naturally have been expected from her own diseased imagination. The house would be full of gentlemen in top-boots or shooting costume, who would smoke in the drawing-room, spit about the floors, drink champagne all day long, and be very rude and vulgar in their language, if not in their behaviour. "You'll have to smoke

yourself, my dear, in self-defence. The servants do as they like—no one keeps them in order. No one ever goes to Church. You'll have to play cards for money. This is what Mrs. Alice has brought us to!"

And all this might be for an indefinite time. All that Emily knew was that Charlie was to leave her when the time came, at the end of October, for his resumption of those arduous studies in the law which seemed so easily forgotten during the Long Vacation. She herself, as far as she knew, might stay away at least till Christmas. In the meanwhile, she was to be all alone at Flaxhead, without even her brother to take care of her. For almost the first time in her life, Emily felt rebellious. It was not altogether for her own sake. She had hoped that while she was in the house she might have found opportunities of lightening the heavy yoke which was being fastened round Alice's neck. The experience of despotic and tyrannical governments, such as that of the Czar at present and of the English in Ireland in the last century, was repeated on a small scale in the once peaceful household of the new Archdeacon. The overstraining of authority to the extent of obvious hardship and injustice on her father's part, began to turn the honest straightforward Emily into a conspirator. Schemes came into her head, almost against her will, as to measures that might be taken for the relief of the oppressed. Charlie was on the same side, but he was very much afraid of his father. Emily's little plans were not very adroit. One or two notes that she put under a plate on its way to Alice, assuring her of her love and telling her about her children, were ignominiously detected. Then she thought that perhaps the new servant might be made a friend of. But instead of approaching her by presents to herself, she began by trying to get her to take innocuous messages to Alice. Here too she was found out by her father. The dragon in charge might perhaps have been bought, but she was not open to arguments and appeals to her feelings. Poor Emily was scolded for her pains, and treated like a deceitful instrument of the enemy. Her attempts only hastened on her own banishment. Before this happened, however, she managed to have a talk with Father White about Alice, and she got from him a good many hints which she was to convey to her if occasion served. The chief of these was that she was to be very gentle and submissive to her husband for the present, and to trust a great deal to prayer. She was on no account to think of making any com-

promise as to attending the Protestant service, family prayers, or anything of that kind. On the other hand, she was not to be anxious for the present as to the positive obligations of her religion, such as attending Mass and the like, which in her position were not possible to her. Her state of health for the present excused her from abstinence. He assured her that a great many persons all over England were praying for her in her trials. Thus much Emily did manage to convey to Alice the night before she left home herself. She actually ventured on the offer of five shillings to the dragon as a present, and the little note which she also thrust into her hand was conveyed to its destination.

On arriving at Flaxhead, Emily was most agreeably undeceived as to her new friend. Nothing could be more cordial and affectionate than her greeting by Lady Susan. She could be very pleasant when she chose, and she did choose to make love to Emily. The freshness and simplicity of the country girl won her at once. Moreover, she sympathized with Emily as to the treatment of Alice. She made even humble apologies for her own part in taking her away from her home, and for her inability to make her as comfortable as she might have been at Osminster. Then all the vaticinations of Aunt Joanna were at once falsified. It happened that just at this time Lady Susan's sister-in-law, Lady Templebar, died suddenly, and the whole of her family were plunged in deep grief. There could be no festivities at Flaxhead that October—no great shooting parties, no houseful, indeed no guests at all in the ordinary sense of the word. Lady Susan even gave out that she should not hunt that year. At one time there was a chance that her brother might come down and stay for a fortnight, but even this vanished. It may be that one or two of Lady Susan's plans had to be surrendered. She may have thought of producing Emily, and watching her success with an almost motherly interest. Perhaps it may even have occurred to her that she should be glad to see some of the not quite sincere admiration, of which she was herself still the occasional object, transferred to her young guest. Most of these dreams had to be surrendered, but Lady Susan was not sorry. Emily charmed her and refreshed her. She brought a new breath of nature and simplicity into her life, and she had not had her for a week before she felt how much she gained by her hospitality. In a short time Miss Westmore was mistress of the situation—only she was too simple to see her



power. Meanwhile she had to submit to a certain amount of transformation as the condition of her unconscious empire.

The first phase of this transformation may easily be guessed. Emily must be dressed. It cannot be supposed that the dressing of Osminster was of a very high scale of excellence—and Lady Susan's tastes were decidedly high on this point. She had always thought it one of the chiefest of woman's duties to dress well, and perhaps she had reached a time of life when it made a considerable difference to her whether this duty were well or ill performed in her own case. Her new maid, the successor to the discharged sister of Mr. Thomas Watcomb, was a mistress in the art. She went into a little fit of artistic hysterics over Miss Westmore's costume. That excellent young person had never thought much of the matter hitherto, and she had implicit confidence in the reigning dressmaker of Osminster, who had no great field for the display of any eminent refinement of taste among the ladies for whom she worked. There was a great deal to reform indeed. Lady Susan and her maid were very serious over it. Emily, they agreed, was worth dressing—her figure was fine, if it was only properly displayed. She submitted with more resignation than thankfulness. She was soon furnished with a number of dresses such as she had never dreamed of possessing, except in the distant and, as she thought, altogether improbable event of her marriage. Her old gowns vanished in some mysterious manner. The little maid who had been allotted to her special service from the moment of her arrival, never could find Miss Westmore's old gowns. So Emily had not only to appear in the evening in her new costumes, but to live in them from morning to night. One morning she caught a glimpse of herself in the glass of the drawing-room as she passed through to breakfast. As she stood looking with amazement at her transformation, Charlie came in by a side door, caught her in his arms, and began telling her how handsome she was. Her usual resource with him was to try to box his ears, and the result on this occasion was a scene of slight romping between the brother and sister which was not altogether Parisian in its elegance. It went on for a minute or two before the persons concerned were aware that their hostess was looking on. She gently warned Emily that her dress might perhaps give way if she were to bounce about in the manner to which she had been accustomed of old. Indeed, a button or two had got out of gear. "There is no help for it, my dear," she said, kissing her

affectionately. "Muscular action is beautiful; but you must really remember that something is due to the artist who dresses you."

The next thing after dressing Emily in a proper manner, was to teach her to ride. It must not be supposed that the young lady in question had never before mounted a horse, or, indeed, that she was far behind the ordinary girl of her age in the accomplishment of which Englishwomen are so fond. But to ride in the ordinary sense of the term, and in the sense which was attached to it by the circle in which Lady Susan moved, were two different things. Emily had never taken a fence, never followed the hounds, and made her way across country. To all this higher line of equestrianism she was now to be initiated under the careful superintendence of her father's friend, although for the present it was not possible for her to ride to hounds. There was a good deal of improvement to be wrought in her style of riding before she could even hope to do credit to her training in the Park at London, should the time ever come when she could put in an appearance there. In the modern games at which ladies are now expected to be adepts, Emily was already quite as proficient, and more so, than the elder lady, who did not find great personal activity and agility much to her taste. Lady Susan had the wisdom never to attempt anything for which she was not fit. And so she left these sports to younger and lighter frames; but she took a real pleasure in bringing Emily out of the somewhat provincial style in which she had been brought up.

In the matter of books and reading, Lady Susan was very considerate. She would not, she said to herself, have a girl of her own brought up as she had been brought up. She made no attempt to get Emily to read the sort of trash, or the worse than trash, on which her own mind had been fed. She made her order her own books from Mudie's, and went so far as to try to fit her out with a small library such as she had left at home. It is true that she had not herself much relish for the *Daisy Chains* and *Heartseases*, and other endless works of Miss Yonge and Miss Sewell, which were the fashionable food for the young ladies of Emily's set. But Lady Susan made no objection to them, and she very carefully moved away from sight a good many of her own favourites. "If I were beginning again at her age," she said to herself, "I would have nothing to do with them." Altogether, she took thought and pains to do for Emily

what her own mother might have done. In many such respects Emily's visit was not without its effects upon Lady Susan. She had never had any children to take care of, and her own youth had not been happy. It was a new and a very wholesome interest for her to have the companionship of a fresh bright girl, simple and grateful enough for anything, but at the same time strong and determined in her integrity and purity.

A word or two ought to be said, in order to give some completeness to this account of Emily's life at Flaxhead, as to the religious arrangements of the place. In these days it becomes a matter of serious importance to persons of the High Church School, whether they can find the "privileges" to which they have been accustomed in any new scenes which they may visit. In old days, one Anglican church was much like another as to outward observances, much as one Catholic church is like another Catholic church all the world over—though in the former case there was the greatest possible divergence as to the doctrine which might be heard from the pulpit in various places. Now it is almost as difficult for a Ritualist to satisfy himself in an ordinary Anglican church, as it might be, on other grounds, for a Catholic. Emily was a simple girl, and did not care very much for the vestments and the like which her father had introduced at Osminster, and which he had now banished. But she liked frequent opportunities of going to her Communion, and she liked to have it early in the morning before breakfast. She liked a musical service in which the Psalms, or at least the Canticles, were chanted, and she was fond of the hymns which have become so common of late years, but which, not more than twenty years ago, were considered "Low Church." In all these respects she had a little to suffer at Flaxhead. The church was a small old dilapidated building, with a squat white tower, and no architectural beauty. The pew of the great house occupied nearly the whole of the chancel. The clergyman was an old gentleman who took his duties very easily—Communion once a month, after the morning service at eleven, and there was no singing at all. Altogether the performance of the service at Flaxhead could not be characterized by either of those favourite epithets of the High Church Papers—"warm" or "hearty." The church was a good half-mile from the house, and there was an afternoon service on the Sunday to which it was not the custom for the great people of the Hall to go. Emily managed to assert her independence in this respect; but the very dull

catechizing of a few poor children by the Vicar—if catechizing it could be called, being the simple repetition of the questions and answers in the Prayer-book—did not make it a very attractive performance. Sunday was a day which hung heavy on her at Flaxhead. It was the day in the week on which she was in the habit of working hardest, and she missed her class and her young girls very much indeed. After a time she found out one or two poor families in the neighbourhood whom she could visit, and thus she supplied in some measure what was one of her chief occupations at home.

Master Charlie was in a high state of enjoyment, marred only at first and to some extent by the want of companionship. He was very nearly monarch of all that he surveyed. He rode and fished and shot as he chose, and the grooms and keepers, and other people of that sort, were as civil to him as if he had been the heir-apparent to the dominion of Flaxhead. Lady Susan petted him, and Emily was, as ever, his obedient servant. It has been said that at first this young gentleman was lonely. But even this small drawback to his happiness was soon removed. It was Lady Susan's way to send the brother and sister out riding in the afternoon when she wished to be alone, or thought that they would like one another's company better than hers. In this way they explored a good many of the sights of the neighbourhood, and got to know their way pretty well over the flat-topped hills and moors of which that part of the county mainly consists. On one of these expeditions they had made out a well-known spot, called the Six-Cross-Hollow, a favourite place for the meets of the hunt in the season. The hollow was nothing but a slight bowl-shaped cavity in the moorland, on the summit of one of the long ridges already mentioned. It was about half a mile in diameter each way, and was edged by a gentle slope on all sides. If that part of the country had ever been volcanic, it might have been thought to be the filled up basin of an extinct volcano. There were at different spots of the circular ridge, three large clumps of beeches, conspicuous for many miles round, on account of the height of the ground on which they stood. The hollow lay between several of the larger villages or small towns of the county, and thus it was that three lines of road crossed each other in the very centre of the sunk plain—at a place occupied by a fairly substantial-looking inn or tavern. The Six-Cross Inn had been famous in the old coaching days for the number

of coaches which changed their horses there. It had also had a great business as a posting-house, and was frequented at certain times of the year by sportsmen, for coursing or hunting. It is needless to say that its glories were now departed, though it still kept up its name among the sportsmen of the county, and was a house of call for many marketers and travellers.

We shall have something to say presently about the Six-Cross Inn, but for the moment it is enough to record that on a bright afternoon in the October of which we are speaking, Charles and Emily Westmore were breathing their steeds on the turf edge of the circular basin of the hollow, when they found another pair of equestrians approaching them with every apparent intention of making their acquaintance. They too were alike enough to be recognized as brother and sister, and they rode straight up as if they knew who Charlie and Emily were. They might have met in the deserts of Arabia, but there would have been no chance of their passing each other with a stiff bow in silence—as is said sometimes to have happened when English people who have never been “introduced” to one another meet under such circumstances—for between Charlie and the young gentleman who rode so gallant a steed on that afternoon there existed the all-powerful link of Etonianism. “Hey! Westmore,” and “Hey! Spanmore,”—and the parties were at once friends. The sisters were introduced, and began to make acquaintance at once, while the two young gentlemen ran over the names and fortunes of some of their more intimate common friends.

Bertram Spanmore was the nephew and heir of the red-faced squire whose name has already occurred in these pages. He was five or six years older than Charlie, and so might not have remembered him but for the accident that they had both been in the house of the same tutor. There was no fear lest Charlie should not remember Spanmore. The latter had been a hero in his way, a mighty cricketer and football player, and one of the leading spirits in the school in every way, besides a distinguished scholar and a “master” who was very kind to his “fags.” The merest notice from such a celebrity would have made Charlie very proud in his early years at Eton. Now, however, Spanmore had just finished his career at Oxford, where he had gained his first class with unusual distinction. He was a fine, handsome young man of good presence and manners, very well received in the county as the best

possible successor to his uncle. His sister was about Emily's age, quite as handsome in her way as her brother. On the afternoon in question it turned out that the Spanmores were in deliberate quest of Charlie and Emily. They had seen them at a distance, and had determined to claim acquaintance. Spanmore Lodge was at the distance of a mile from the Six-Cross Hollow, and its inmates had heard of the arrival of their new friends in the neighbourhood. Their uncle was as anxious as themselves that the relations between the two houses should be frequent and intimate. The meeting on the hill was succeeded by regular calls and visits, and led to many appointments for excursions and explorations of the country.

---

## CHAPTER XXXII.

### THE PARLOUR OF THE SIX-CROSS INN.

At the time of which we are speaking, the Six-Cross Inn was changing hands. The late occupant had died, and his wife and only child, a girl of ten years of age, were evidently incompetent to carry on the business. The widow was glad enough to get out of so lonely a spot, and had concluded a bargain with an old acquaintance of our readers, by which the goodwill of this important property was to be made over to him. The lease was renewable at Lady Day, and it was a necessary part of the transaction that the new occupant should have an understanding with the landlord, no other than Mr. Spanmore, as to his prospects of a renewal. Mr. Spanmore had given no distinct pledge, but he had said that he would not oppose any respectable person who might make good terms with the widow. Thus it was that Mr. Thomas Watcomb was in the act of transferring himself to the inn in question just about the time of the meeting of the two pair of equestrians mentioned in the last chapter.

Mr. Thomas Watcomb had married almost immediately after leaving the service of Lady Susan. His bride was the daughter of a tradesman in the neighbouring town of Maunton, a young woman of little experience, who had been easily captivated by Mr. Thomas' good looks and ready attentions. She had a little money from her father, and Tom had himself some small fund to fall back upon, chiefly from the great kindness of his mistress. The honeymoon was hardly over, before Tom



proposed to settle at the Six-Cross Inn. He was well known to the country gentlemen and farmers round about, and he might hope well enough to get on, if he could but conquer his fatal fondness for the bottle. But this was a very important "if" indeed. It is no doubt a landlord's interest to keep himself sober, however much he may rejoice in the indulgence which others allow themselves. But Mr. Watcomb, as a tavern-keeper, would have the most unlimited and uncontrolled access to the cellar, and he might say to himself that his customers paid for all that he took. Those who knew him well declared that it would never do. Lady Susan was determined that it should not be, if she could prevent it. She refused in the most peremptory way to lend him some money to make his start. "Anything but that, Tom," she said. He had reckoned upon her unailing good nature, and was very angry at the refusal. She further irritated him by speaking to his wife on the subject. Sarah had only been a bride a few weeks, and she had already had to suffer from her husband's fatal propensity. She had been driven to a far too early exercise of that shrill member which is so often the only resource of an ill-treated wife. Her father had interposed, but this only made Mr. Thomas more obstinate. He pledged himself beyond recall to the widow of the former occupant. He hurried on his taking possession before he had made his ground quite certain with Mr. Spanmore, and Sarah found herself doomed to the encouraging prospect of a lonely life in Six-Cross Hollow with a man who had already shown her that he could use his arms as well as his tongue when he was in a passion.

Sarah was standing very disconsolately in the door of her new home. It was an afternoon which had suddenly become overcast, and a heavy shower had begun to fall. Our four young friends had been riding in the neighbourhood, and came galloping down one of the roads which met in front of the house. Bertram and Charles were off their steeds in a moment, and ready to help their sisters off, that they might escape the drenching which threatened them.

The gentlemen had to lead the horses to the stables themselves. Mr. Watcomb was away from his new home. He had gone to Maunton to make some purchases. His wife did her best to make the young ladies comfortable during their enforced stay under her roof-tree. By way of paying for their shelter, the party ordered some tea and cake, and this repast was soon

produced by the only servant whom Mrs. Watcomb had at her command. The only room available was the parlour, and this was in a state of admirable confusion, half full of boxes, the chairs and tables not arranged, the pictures and prints piled on the floor, and the like. The contents of this room furnished fair material out of which much of the former life of the new tenants of the inn might have been gathered. There were some of Sarah's prize books from the school at which she had been educated, some specimens of work, and some outrageous daubs in watercolour, which showed that at some period of her education she had dabbled in the fine arts. Mr. Watcomb's contributions to the adornment of this *sanctum* seemed to consist chiefly in portraits of famous race horses, or coloured prints of marvellous feats in the hunting-field. There were gentlemen in red clearing wide and raging brooks in triumph, while other less fortunate Nimrods were floundering in the waves or in the mud. One was forcing his way through a bullfinch fence, and another descending easily on the further side of a turnpike gate, which the worthy tollman had not had the time or the grace to open to him. However, our business is not at present with all these achievements, but with a poor dingy photograph to which Bertram Spanmore drew the attention of Emily, while her brother was engaged in explaining to Florence the various horses and jockeys in a picture of the start for the Derby. The photograph could not be mistaken. It was a very bad version indeed of the picture at Flaxhead, of which mention has already been made, in which Lady Susan was represented standing by the side of her favourite hunter, with Mr. Thomas Watcomb on the further side of the same animal. Emily had heard Lady Susan regret that she had ever had the picture painted. She had found out that it was a mistake to put herself into the same picture with her groom. It seemed quite certain that the photograph must have been taken without her knowledge, and she would probably be annoyed to hear of its existence. Emily told all this to her companion. He asked her, in a low voice, to make an opportunity of finding out from Mrs. Watcomb where the copies of the photograph could be procured. Sarah said she believed that it had been taken by a friend of her husband's in Maunton, but that she had never heard him speak of having any copies for sale. "Say as little about it as possible," said Bertram to Emily. "Find out from Lady Susan whether she knows any-

thing of it, and let me know. This fellow is quite capable of giving her annoyance if he finds out that he can do so. It is much better not to let him see it too soon."

The Spanmores rode with Emily and Charles almost up to the door of Flaxhead. In the evening, Emily told Lady Susan what she had seen at the Six-Cross Inn.

"The rascal!" said the elder lady. "He asked my leave to have a photograph taken when the picture came from London, and I refused. He knows that I hate photographs, and that I should never think of letting that picture be taken. It must have been done when I was away in the summer, at the Woodbrooks, where I met your father, my dear. It is most impertinent. I know now what he meant when he was grumbling at me the other day for not lending him money to start his new tavern with. We must get hold of the negative at once, and have it destroyed. Old Mr. Spanmore must do it, or the young gentleman, perhaps, your friend, Emily. So you are to let him know what I feel about it, are you? A nice little arrangement indeed! No, I must write to him myself. I shall say that you are too shy."

The note was duly written, then and there, and sent over by a special messenger to Spanmore Lodge. Lady Susan said that Emily had told her of the existence of the obnoxious photograph, and that she herself should feel greatly obliged to Bertram to take the matter up, and secure the negative and all the copies, if possible. If there was anything to be paid, it must be done. Perhaps there might be something not legal about the surreptitious manner in which the negative had been taken, and it might be well to frighten Mr. Watcomb and his ally before condescending to bribe them. Bertram was very happy to have something of the kind to do for Lady Susan, and his uncle was almost happy that she was in trouble out of which he might be able to help her.

His first impulse was to drive out to the Six-Cross Hollow and threaten Mr. Watcomb into surrendering the photograph then and there. But his nephew persuaded him that he had better let him manage the matter more quietly. It might give more trouble if too much fuss was made over the business.

It may be questioned whether the elder gentleman would have had any great difficulty in bringing about the surrender of the photograph, inasmuch as his power as landlord over Tom Watcomb gave him a position of irresistible strength in the

negotiation. But Bertram took a pleasure in diplomacy for its own sake, and he resolved to carry the matter according to the rules of art. He rode over in the course of the morning, and found Mr. Thomas at home. Sarah had not mentioned to him the little incident of Miss Westmore's inquiry about the photograph. Bertram Spanmore began by asking about a two-year old colt which he had heard of as being in the possession of Mr. Watcomb, and which was supposed to be an animal of much promise as a hunter by-and-bye. The colt was duly admired and praised.

"If it looks as well this time next year, Mr. Watcomb, I shall like to hear the price. But these handsome young things often turn out badly."

Tom was eloquent on this point, and named several famous instances in which large sums of money had been given for young colts which had afterwards turned out worthless. But this particular colt, he said, had certain points of promise about him which forbade the chance of disappointment.

"I dare say you are right, Tom," Bertram said, deferentially, "but I must wait, for all that. I suppose I shall find you here next season, when I come down?"

Tom explained that that might depend in some measure on the young gentleman's own uncle. Perhaps his honour would speak a good word for him?

It was now time for the diplomatic envoy to stroll casually into the parlour. There he found Sarah, who received him with a curtesy of recognition.

"You don't know, Mr. Watcomb, that we made the acquaintance of your wife yesterday? She gave us a very good cup of tea." Then he looked round, and his eyes fell on the photograph.

"What have we here?" he said, examining it. "What a libel on you, Tom! I wonder this good lady can stand this. The horse is not so bad, and the lady is well enough. But it makes you look twice your girth. No great artist the man who took that! It's all out of focus. Your feet are twice as big as your head, your nose is awry, and your eyes squint. I saw the picture the other day, and there's none of all this there."

Sarah, when she was appealed to, allowed the charge about the feet. She didn't quite see the squint.

"Anyhow, it's a libel on you, poor fellow. It makes you look stupid—like a man who's had too much."

This thrust delighted Sarah. "It is a little stupid," Mr. Spanmore," she said. "I always do say to Tom ——" But here she was interrupted by a significant tread on the toe from her lord and master.

"If I were you, I should buy up all the copies of that beautiful concern, and have them destroyed. But, by-the-bye, had the artist leave to take it from Lady Susan?"

Tom acknowledged that he had not. "I don't think her ladyship knew anything about it," he said; "she doesn't like being photographed."

"And this man did it without her leave?"

"Well, sir, I thought that as my face was in the picture, I might have myself copied as often as I liked," said Tom, appealing to some unwritten law of nature, of which it is probable the courts at Westminster have never heard.

"It's lucky that Lady Susan Bland is not likely to prosecute," said Bertram. "But I think your friend might get into a scrape for this. The picture belongs to her, or to the artist, as far as copyright is concerned. By-the-bye, this must be what my uncle was speaking of the other day. He must have heard of it, I think. He said some impudent fellow had been photographing Lady Susan without her leave. I fear you'll have some trouble about this, Tom." Mr. Bertram looked very grave. "What was that you said just now about your lease?"

"I always says to Tom ——" said Sarah again. But she was again stopped. This time by a threatening look.

Tom was a coward at heart, and he knew nothing about law. So he determined to capitulate at once. It was not worth his while to quarrel with Mr. Spanmore, and that gentleman had the character of being a very fast friend or a very disagreeable foe.

The diplomatic Bertram accepted the capitulation carelessly. He would do what he could with his uncle, if the photograph were at once surrendered to him, negative, copies and all. "It will please Mr. Spanmore if you do this, for I know he would be very sorry that Lady Susan should be vexed."

The negotiation ended in Tom's promising to let Bertram have the negative and the copies that had been taken, that same evening. He would go at once into Maunton, and settle the matter with his friend the photographer.

After all, he had some difficulty in accomplishing his part of the treaty. His friend the photographer was much inclined

to take the opinion of a certain Radical attorney in the town, who was usually on the side against the gentry and the clergy. There is no saying what this wise member of the profession might have advised for the sake of mischief. But Tom's father-in-law was made privy to the affair, and he was so strong on the side of submission, that the others gave way at once. Greatly to the triumph of Mr. Spanmore, the bargain which his nephew had made was faithfully executed.

It was an occasion not to be missed. He drove over in state, that is, in a phaeton instead of a dogcart, with Florence and Bertram, to Flaxhead, and deposited the trophy which had been won by the intervention of the forces of the house of Spanmore. He had been hesitating whether he should renew this autumn the yearly tender of his alliance of which Lady Susan had spoken so unfeelingly to Mr. Westmore. But this accident of the photograph had decided him to try his fortune once more. There was a sort of "Laird of Cockpen" feeling in his heart as he drove up. Surely "she'd be daft to refuse," after such a service.

Lady Susan was sincerely grateful, and showed her gratitude by giving him the most gracious reception. Never had she seemed to him so charming. She forced him to stay for luncheon, and seemed pleased when he followed her into the drawing-room after the meal, instead of taking his immediate departure. She confided to him she meant to give up hunting for the future, and told him more little matters about her affairs and property than was her wont. She spoke to him about her interest in Emily and Charlie, and seemed to wish that the friendship which had sprung up between the young people might ripen, and even "lead to something" by-and-bye. But in the end, when he approached the old subject, she gave him a very kind and a very decided answer. Before she had treated him with scorn and scant civility, now she was courteous, and almost affectionate. But it was not to be.

"My good old friend," she said, "don't be foolish any more. I am not going to marry again, and I should be very sorry if my resolution were to produce any estrangement between us. Let us be good friends and neighbours, and let that suffice." Nor, with all his entreaties and protestations, could he get from her a word except in this sense. He had at last to leave her with a heavy heart, but also with a more settled conviction that he must make up his mind to his disappointment than he had ever



felt in the days when she had dismissed him with mockery and levity. His nephew and niece, meanwhile, had been strolling about with Charles and Emily, and had evidently enjoyed their visit.

---

CHAPTER XXXIII.

"LE MIE PRIGIONI."

It has been already hinted that Mr. Westmore was not quite prepared to carry out, without mitigation, the counsels which Mr. Woodbrook had administered to him as to the treatment of his refractory wife. Alice could make no resistance to his anger. He did not see her, nor communicate with her ordinarily in any way. There was nothing for his anger to feed itself upon. She was entirely in his power, and the extreme depression and weakness in which her confinement had left her had at first almost the effect of stupefaction. The servant told him that she had cried when she read his letter, but had said nothing, except to ask wistfully when she could see her child. He himself, angry as he was, went out twice a week to the farmhouse, five miles off, where the children were being nursed, and spent some time in fondling and caressing them. It was impossible not to think of the mother when he pressed his lips on the children. They thrived well, and there was no anxiety about them, though, as we shall see, this was not quite the report concerning them which reached Alice. Their father did not do all that he was urged to do in the way of severity. He did not take away Alice's books. She had already a small Catholic library, a great part of which he had himself given her at various times. He told the servant to bring her what she asked for of her own in this way, though he insisted on her having a large Protestant Bible and Prayer-book on her table. No other Bible was allowed her. He would have let her "abstain" if the doctor had permitted it, and when Mr. Bland insisted on her having meat every day, he wrote a note to tell her that it was necessary for her health, and that the "Roman authorities" did not insist on their rules in such cases. Happily, Alice had already received the same instruction from another source. Her husband even sent her little presents of flowers or fruit or game. But still the blockade was severe, and the entire seclusion of the rooms in which she lived from the rest of the house could hardly have

been more rigidly secured than it was. Then there were little persecuting measures which might have been spared—a good many of which came simply from Joanna. If there was anything in the *Church Times*, for instance, particularly offensive to Catholics or to converts; if it were rumoured that this or that illustrious convert wanted to be back again, and had more sympathy with Anglicans than with his own people; if there were any scandals chronicled, real or imaginary; if any priest went wrong, or if any of the occasional questions of right which in a complex system like that of the Catholic Church sometimes arise among ecclesiastics, were caught hold of and misrepresented in such papers as that which we have named, a copy of that journal was sure to find its way to Alice. Anti-Catholic pamphlets, *Eirenicons*, *Maria Monks*, and other similar publications, were put on her table, along with a number of the High Church magazines or papers, in which the extraordinary fecundity and prosperity of the Anglican missions to the heathen, or the consoling successes of the soupers in Ireland, were magnified to the skies.

Alice, for her part, as she gradually woke up more and more to her position and prospects, cared very little for small annoyances such as these. She had a kind of instinct that they did not come so much from her husband as from his sister. It was thought better, as has been said, that Mr. Westmore should not see his wife for the present, but this did not prevent Aunt Joanna from paying Alice occasional visits. These visits were not the most lively times for the poor prisoner. At her best, Aunt Joanna was always on the gloomy side, and her views of things in general were never encouraging. Everybody always looked ill, everybody seemed dreadfully unhappy, everybody was on the brink of ruin, moral or material. The harvest had always been a bad one, or was sure to be a bad one—the east winds were never going to cease, the trade of the country was always in a terrible way, strikes were always to be expected, and general bankruptcy was always imminent. Of course, Aunt Joanna was not likely to be more cheerful than usual in her accounts to Alice of the state of things in that external world from which the young lady was so carefully excluded. But the refinement of Aunt Joanna's inventiveness of evil was shown in her stories about the children, including Emily and Charlie. Emily was away—this Alice knew well enough. It was not very unlikely that she should be unhappy at a distance from all

her ordinary friends and occupations. The truth was that Emily did not often write to her aunt, but that, when she did, there was but little indeed in her letters which could give any colour to the ingenious pictures of misery which were drawn by Joanna. Emily, according to this good lady, was becoming "fast" in despair. She was throwing herself into vulgar and irreligious company, in a reckless mood, because Alice had made it impossible for her to live at home. She was getting fond of that Lady Susan—which was true enough—and was making her her model and pattern. Her religious opinions were becoming like those which her brother had occasionally aired. Charlie was going on in a very reckless way also. But the particular torture which Joanna loved to administer to Alice consisted in the gloomiest account of Alice's own children. She had soon found out that the motherly yearning was by far the predominant element in her nature at present, and that she asked after her babes with a straining wistfulness which revealed a very sore heart indeed. It cannot be said whether Joanna was conscious of a malignant joy at the opportunity which thus presented itself. Persons of her disposition—which is often as much to be attributed to mental disease as to malice—must not always be judged like other folk. But it is certain that, if Aunt Joanna had set herself of deliberate purpose to invent whatever could give most pain to her victim with reference to these two babies, she could hardly have done more than she did to make her unhappy. And then it was always so easy to say, "You know, my dear, that it rests altogether with yourself to set all this right. No one can take care of children like their mother." We have read that Taicosama, or some other persecutor of the same class, once forced a number of Christian mothers to apostatize, by collecting their children and torturing them in a place where the poor mothers could hear all the cries of the infants. The picture which Joanna drew for Alice of the miseries of her children was not exactly brutal in all its features. But she gave her to understand that they were ill-cared for, that their health was suffering: that the little one, in particular, was terribly sickly and unlikely to thrive as it was—and then sometimes she would decline to say anything about them. She would turn off Alice's entreating questions with a sneer, and tell her that she had much better come back to her duties and look after them herself.

Alice had no money, no postage stamps, no letters were

brought her, and when she tried to write a note to Emily she was told by the servant that she must not close it, as Mrs. Millwood was to see everything she wrote. The poor child—for she was little more—sank back into herself, and gave up the hope of communicating with any one. After a time, she hardly cared to take her walk in the garden, and spoke very little indeed, even to her servant and keeper. This latter was a middle-aged woman, of few words, who went about her business very methodically. She had been recommended to Mr. Westmore as a person who could be trusted to do whatever she was told, and of considerable experience in nursing. The servants in general could make nothing of her, and her meals were brought up to her along with Alice's food, but she declined conversation with the maid whose duty it was to wait upon her thus far. The servants were divided as to the treatment of their mistress. Most of them, however, were strongly on her side, and would have done anything in their power to alleviate her condition. Mrs. Millwood was not popular among them, and this of itself told in favour of Alice, who had always been a very kind and considerate mistress. For the moment, most of the real alleviations which were allowed her came, in truth, from her husband. The absence of complaint, the positive silence in which she submitted to her hard lot, told with him. He arranged that she should walk or not, as she liked, that she should walk alone if she chose, that she might lock her room door when she went out, and be in security that any papers or journals she wrote might be free from inspection. He even limited the number and frequency of his sister's visits, and let Alice know from time to time she could have any books that she wanted.

In truth, Mr. Westmore soon found out that it was not quite so easy to execute the plan which Mr. Woodbrook had conceived as to recommend its execution. His own household was more than half against him, and what was more, perhaps, in some respects, public opinion took the side of the oppressed and the silent. Public opinion reached him in many ways and many forms. The man who was the boldest in the expression of his feelings was Mr. Hornsea. Mr. Barker at this time fell ill, and as the new curate who had succeeded Mr. Bellicent was very young, the Archdeacon had to lean more than usual on the active assistance of Mr. Hornsea. This gentleman always made a point of asking after Alice whenever he had an opportunity,

and he did this by preference when others were present. At clerical meetings and other less formal gatherings of the same sort, the question was usually productive of an uncomfortable pause. When it was asked in more general company, there was often an interest manifested as to the answer, which showed the Archdeacon on which side the general feeling lay. One day, however, when they were quite alone, Mr. Hornsea took up his parable with more decided boldness. He asked his chief whether Mrs. Westmore was allowed to see her children: "There can be no reason for keeping her from them, at all events," he said drily.

Some months before, Mr. Westmore would have told him to mind his own business, and picked a quarrel with him at once. But he could not do so now. It was evident that Mr. Hornsea was not afraid of him, though it was not quite so clear that he was not afraid of Mr. Hornsea.

"You will forgive me for speaking to your face, dear Archdeacon," said the latter, 'what a hundred persons say day after day behind your back. Your character is of importance to us all, and the Church suffers if you are spoken against with reason."

"I suppose," said the Archdeacon angrily, "that you would not have me see my children made Romanists before my own eyes?"

"It is hardly a question of that," said the other; "they are both infants, and their mother has a right and a duty to them. It will be years yet before they can tell the difference between one phase of Christianity and another. But it is not Christian to put her to torture by keeping them out of her sight. She has as much right to them as you have, and the law would give it her if she were to seek it in that way."

"The case is not likely to come into the Courts," said the Archdeacon coolly; "she has no means of bringing it there."

"That does not alter the rights of the case," replied the curate. "You are acting on the principle that might makes right. The only possible success to which you can look is that perhaps you may force your wife by hard usage to conform to our religion, and act the hypocrite. That is not the idea of Protestantism which Englishmen commonly hold. If you succeed in this way, there is no conviction or persuasion about the matter. She yields to force, just as if she sacrificed to Jupiter or became a Mahometan to save her life."

"I must take my own course, Mr. Hornsea," said the Archdeacon stiffly. "You are not a married man, and cannot feel what a desolation has been brought into my home by what my wife has done."

"It is because I feel so much for you, my dear Archdeacon, that I venture to brave your anger by thus speaking to you what I and a great many others conceive to be the truth. I consider that what you are doing is more hurtful to the truth of our religion than the step which your wife has been so mistaken as to take. She has gone wrong on a point of controversy, as to which there have been different opinions among Christians for many generations. You are acting against the universal laws of charity and natural right. You will have to give way. Mrs. Westmore will wear you out. What you are doing will come home to you in a hundred different ways. Meanwhile you are turning all the sympathy of people who know the facts, away from the Church of England towards that of Rome. Persecution never has a chance of success unless it is thorough and sticks at nothing. Even then success is ephemeral. But your style of persecution is just savage enough to make people hate it, and not savage enough to have a chance of gaining its object."

The Archdeacon was very angry, and he ended the conversation almost rudely. But he had got the worst of the encounter. He was too proud to acknowledge this, even to himself, then and there. But Mr. Hornsea's words remained on his mind, and as the weeks wore on, he began to see that they might come true. Other things soon came to enforce this suspicion, of which we shall speak hereafter.

But even, as it was, the witnesses against him seemed wonderfully multitudinous and uniform. When he went among the poor, the old people asked him about Mrs. Westmore, or they expressed their wish to see Emily back. One or two of the tradespeople or farmers "Hoped no offence" to his Reverence, and then said that they should all be glad to see Mrs. Westmore coming among them again. They were respectful in their manner, but they showed surprise at what was being done. Then it was not so easy to put forward a tolerably respectable view of what this was that was being done. Alice's health was the ground pleaded at first, and then hints were given by Joanna that she was rather weak-headed. But it was known that no one was allowed to see her, and reports flew



about among that part of the population which was not so friendly to the Vicar, which were exaggerated and far blacker than the reality which they represented. These reports related as much to the banishment of Emily as to the imprisonment of Alice. Did he miss them himself? At least he was lonely. No one sympathized with him, except Joanna and certain clerical correspondents at a distance. The household did not prosper under Aunt Joanna. Though she had governed before Alice came, the servants were sulky under her now. Mr. Westmore found himself oppressed by the part he was playing. He got to be afraid of being asked questions—he imagined meanings in innocent remarks that were made in his presence. He had been a fierce defiant man, and he had thought that he did not care what people thought or said about him. All this was changed. Besides, Alice had always been an affectionate and tender wife, Emily had always been a devoted daughter, and she was just now grown to an age when she was full of interest to him, and able to help him in a thousand ways. Fifty times a day he wanted his slaves, who had been ever at his beck, and saved him a score of troubles. Nor were his feelings all for his own losses. His heart could not help pleading silently for the objects which it loved best, even though it loved rather selfishly always. He was in a wayward, unsettled mood—he felt as if he was being drawn this way or that, by powers whose action he had not recognized before. The work of his new office took him away from Osminster occasionally, and for this he was far from sorry. He was almost angry now, when Mr. Woodbrook wrote from time to time, to encourage him in the path which he had suggested, and he was angry too when others, like Mr. Hornsea, showed him how much they disapproved of it.

"When I look back on that time," Alice wrote in her journal long after, "it seems as if it had not been one of the least happy in my life. I was altogether at peace in my own conscience, and this was an ineffable change from the anxieties and doubts and scruples of the years which had preceded that time of imprisonment. Then I had known so little of the Catholic Church and its services, that I could hardly as yet miss them. I longed on Sundays to go to Mass, and still more for Communion, but I used to read over the Mass prayers as if I were present, and I made my Communion in my heart. They thought it was a hardship to me to have the Bible, but I read

it over and over again, and it seemed to me from beginning to end to witness to the faith. I had read somewhere of a Catholic saint, as he was said to be, who had wrought miracles on persons at a distance by saying Mass for them on a particular appointed day, and that his favourite devotion was to go through all the miracles of our Lord, one by one, and ask for what he wanted of Him Who had wrought this and that wonder of the same kind. I thought my deliverance was to come by some miracle, and I used the same kind of prayer in my own way. I was never tired of the Gospels and the Epistles, though of these last there was much that I could not understand. I had also my Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, and I used to read something about the saint of every day. Time was not heavy to me; there was only that terrible craving for my children, and I fear I was told about them many things which were not true, and that and other anxieties drove me to pray, and I should never have known what prayer is, as it seems to me, if I had not had that time of trial. I began by praying for my children and husband, but I gradually came to have far larger interests and desires than those which related to myself and my belongings. I got very fond of that text of St. Paul, where he lays down the different kinds of prayer which he would have made in all places and at all times, and I tried to do my poor part in all. I am sure many people prayed for me. I felt able to leave all my cares, even my fears about the children, in the hands of God, and when the time came, in the end, for my deliverance, I really was not without regret that those days of peace were over."

## *New Solutions of Homeric Problems.*

---

### II.—THE AGE OF THE POEMS.

---

#### PART THE FIRST.

HAVING in former papers examined the structure of the Iliad, and endeavoured to vindicate its organic unity against the theories of separatists, I propose now to discuss the question of the Age of the Homeric Poems, and this especially in reference to the views of Professor Paley.

Before entering upon this subject I must be allowed to say that I express with reluctance my dissent, perhaps on insufficient grounds, from one to whom I am indebted for so much kindness and so much instruction as Professor Paley. The very form of that kindness, however, assures me that discussion, and even dissent, if intelligent, will be more gratifying than silent acquiescence, or the indulgence of any inclination *jurare* (though unconvinced) *in verba magistri*.

Mr. Paley believes, that "our Homer," the Iliad and Odyssey *as we have them*, date no further back than the middle of the fifth century B.C. He thinks that "some time in the fifth century before the Christian era—probably in the time of Pericles—a desire arose to commit to writing the hitherto oral and ever fluctuating literature which passed under the name of Homer."<sup>1</sup> "As we know," he says, "that Apollonius Rhodius, Quintus Smyrnæus, Coluthus, Tryphiodorus, and others *reproduced*, in the epic style of their day, ancient epics which Pindar and the tragic poets knew and used, so some 'Diaskeuast,' or Homeric editor, of unknown name and date, put into the con-

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of Philology*, vol. vi. p. 147. Professor Paley's three pamphlets, entitled respectively "Q. Smyrnæus and the Homer of the Tragic Poets," "Homerus Periclis ætate quinam habitus sit," and "Homeri quæ nunc extant an reliquis cycli carminibus antiquiora jure habita sint," will be here referred to as *Homer and Quintus*, *Homerus*, and *Homer and the Cyclics*.

tinuous form, the artistic and literary shape in which Plato first quotes it, a compilation or epitome from the prodigious mass of orally-recited epics, or *rhapsodies*, which, passing under the name of Homer, referred to the Trojan war. In doing this he made a selection from poems varying in date by many centuries. . . . He did not merely *string together* old ballads; he reduced them into shape, curtailings, re-arranging, interpolating, supplementing where necessary."<sup>2</sup>

Against this view I maintain, without pretending to assign any definite date, that the Homeric poems, even as we have them, are older than any other Greek poetry which we possess; that they certainly are not later than 700 B.C., and may be much earlier. For the present, however, I shall confine myself to the task of rebutting Mr. Paley's theory.

The evidence which in Mr. Paley's opinion tells in favour of his view, he has summed up, in one of his papers in the *Journal of Philology*, under sixteen heads. This number I would venture to reduce, by grouping and re-arrangement, as follows; without, I hope, substantial loss to the argument.

I. "It is nearly certain that no *written* Greek literature existed before, or much before, the middle of the fifth century B.C." This being so, the oral preservation of our *Iliad* and *Odyssey* "genuine and unmixed," for four centuries (?) or thereabouts, "is as nearly an impossibility as we can conceive anything to be."

II. A careful study of Pindar and the poets of the Periclean age shows, Mr. Paley thinks, that they had not "our Homer" before them; or at any rate that they did not "look to our poems as the source of their information."<sup>3</sup> This, he thinks, is all but established:

(a) By the scantiness of their allusions to incidents mentioned in our *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

(b) By their "*ignoring*, as it were, those very scenes and episodes which we regard as the chief beauties of the poet."

(c) By differences of treatment and discrepancies as to

<sup>2</sup> *Macmillan*, March, p. 411.

<sup>3</sup> "It is a fact of the greatest interest, and one that must bear with almost crushing weight on the Homeric controversy, that no less than *sixteen* of the extant Greek tragedies, and *fifty-eight* now lost, . . . refer to events and characters of the Trojan war, but are not, with very few exceptions, identical with those treated and described in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. . . . We are sure of this, viz., that recourse was not had to 'our Homer' for the subjects and materials of the drama" (*Journal of Philology*, vol. v. p. 105. So Preface to *Iliad*, vol. i. p. xxxvii. and *Homerus*, p. 8).

matter of fact when our Homer and the tragic poets *do* relate the same incidents.<sup>4</sup>

(d) By the fact that the tragic poets relate at great length incidents which are barely alluded to in our poems.<sup>5</sup> For it is impossible that the longer accounts should have been developed from the allusions, which by their nature suppose pre-existing sources. These sources, common to our Homer with Pindar and the Tragic, can be identified with the so-called "Cyclic" poems: which are therefore pre-Homeric (in reference to *our* Homer) as well as pre-Periclean.<sup>6</sup>

III. Similar remarks "apply to the vase paintings of the same period, many thousands of which, . . . now open to the examination of all, are stored in the great public museums of Europe. They occasionally illustrate our Homeric texts, but very often the 'Tale of Troy,' as known to the Tragic."<sup>7</sup>

IV. When we find the historians Herodotus and Thucydides referring to Homer or to the Iliad, we have no assurance whatever that they possessed what we now know as the Iliad of Homer; and several of these allusions show that the reverse of this is the case, for that in fact what they knew as the Iliad must have differed in important particulars from our version of the poem.<sup>8</sup>

V. "The language of our Homeric poems, though in the main archaic, is replete with words and idioms, not to say verb-forms of the middle Attic period;" and, what is worse, of glaring *pseudo-archaisms* revealing the hand of, to use Mr. Paley's own word, a "botcher."<sup>9</sup>

VI. There are, besides, certain minor indications of lateness. For example:

<sup>4</sup> "Ita Sophocles (Ai. 1031) vivum, auctor Iliadis mortuum Hectorem Achillis curru raptum descripsit. Agamemnonis cædem Aegistho Odysseæ auctor, Clytemnestræ tribuit Æschylus. Ne Rhesus quidem et Cyclops Euripidis, nec Thersitæ mentio Soph. Phil. 442 ad scriptum poetam nostrum referendi sunt" (*Homerus*, p. 9, note).

<sup>5</sup> "The main topics, not to say the almost hackneyed themes, of the Tragic, occupy" quite a "subordinate place (if indeed any place) in our Homer" (p. 118).

<sup>6</sup> "The materials which Pindar and the Tragic had and the materials which they used were *certainly* not taken directly from our poems. . . . They were as a rule derived from epics which they must have regarded as their sole authority, or in other words which they followed as *the* Homer of their day. And these epics we can identify, not with our Homer, but with other poems that are known to have constituted the earlier and later portions of the so-called Epic Cycle" (p. 116).

<sup>7</sup> P. 116.

<sup>8</sup> Pref. to Iliad, vol. i. pp. xxxii. seq.

<sup>9</sup> "A set of professional men, characteristically called 'fitters' and 'botchers,' βαψφοδοὶ and τέκτονες ὕμνων" (*Journal of Philosophy*, vol. v. p. 124).

(a) "The *euphemistic* language in which Helen is always spoken of in our poems, contrasted with the execration of her name commonly found in Tragic, indicates that the superstition mentioned by Plato in the *Phædrus* in connection with the blindness of Stesichorus, was strongly prevalent when our poems were compiled."<sup>10</sup>

(b) "The minute and technical anatomical nomenclature in the *Iliad* seems to show that the writings or teachings of Hippocrates were familiarly known to the compiler of that poem."<sup>11</sup>

(c) Allusions occur, as it would seem, to historical events in the fifth century B.C., *e.g.*, to the destruction of Mycenæ . . . in 468 (Il. iv. 53), and the building of the Erechtheum on the Athenian acropolis (Od. vii. 81)."<sup>12</sup>

With these several arguments in succession, I will endeavour to deal in the "business-like manner" which Mr. Freeman rightly desiderates in the treatment of a question such as the present.

I. "It is nearly certain that no *written* Greek literature existed before, or much before, the middle of the fifth century B.C." In his defence of this position, Professor Paley has the able support of Mr. Fennell, who maintains "that among the Greeks prose literature was first committed to writing not earlier than the Persian wars, that is, in Ionia not before 500 B.C., in the rest of Greece not before 480 B.C., and that metrical literature was first indited several years later, say 450 B.C."<sup>13</sup>

Appeal is made by Messrs. Paley and Fennell to the testimonies, direct and indirect, positive and negative, of all the earlier Greek authors in both poetry and prose, but a portion of this testimony it will be necessary to enter into with some detail. Herodotus (to begin with the "father of history") opens his great work with these words:

This is the exhibition of the history of Herodotus of Halicarnassus, (composed) to the end that the deeds of men may not become effaced [from memory] by the lapse of time, and that great and wonderful exploits . . . may not be without their meed of renown."

<sup>10</sup> P. 121.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> P. 122.

<sup>13</sup> "On the First Ages of a Written Greek Literature." A paper read before the Cambridge Philosophical Society, Nov. 23, 1868. For a copy of this Essay I am indebted to the kindness of Professor Paley.



In reference to the above passage, Mr. Paley calls attention to "the remarkable expression . . . that he has made an ἀπόδειξις an *ocular display* (so to say), and given a visible and written form to his history, 'that the deeds of men may not become ἐξίτηλα, effaced from the memory, and, as it were, colourless and evanescent.' This sentence alone goes far to prove that he had no knowledge of any written text, and was himself trying a new device to remedy the want of fixed and definite historical records."<sup>14</sup>

Again, in reference to the appeals which Herodotus makes to the authority of λόγοι and λογοποιοὶ (literally "tale-makers"), Mr. Paley says: "The λόγοι, whom this historian mentions in i. 2 and in ii. 3, were what we should call 'authorities in history,' men who had inquired and learned, but had not put into writing, the facts of early or contemporary history. Mr. Blakesley rightly observes that they must have been *oral teachers only*." If this be so, it is plain that those very passages in Herodotus which have been held to imply an acquaintance with a written literature, however scanty, in reality bear indirect testimony to the absence of such a source of information.

To turn next to Thucydides. Here too, say our authors, we find a surprising absence of reference to written authority and an habitual appeal to tradition, or to speak more literally, to *hearsay* (ἀκοή), as the recognized source of historical antiquarian knowledge. Even the passage which might be cited as conclusively proving the existence of a pre-Thucydidean written prose literature is ingeniously turned by Mr. Paley so as to have a contrary sense. The expression used by Thucydides in describing the labours of his predecessors is συντιθέναι, not συγγράφειν, which is used by implication of Hellenistic only. Now the expression σύνθετοι λόγοι is used by Æschylus to mean *fictitious stories*, whence Mr. Paley argues: "It is probable then that συντιθέναι, as distinct from συγγράφειν, was used to describe the narratives composed for public oral recitation, whether written or (which I suspect was more common) intended to be learnt by heart, by men called λόγοι or λογοποιοὶ, such as Hecataeus of Miletus, who is occasionally [three times] referred to by Herodotus."

Two passages from Pindar next call for notice. In one (Od. vi. 91) the poet addresses Æneas, the messenger by whom he sends an ode to Agesias, in these words:

<sup>14</sup> *Journal of Philology*, vol. v. p. 227.

ἑσσι γὰρ ἔγγελοι ὀρθῶς,  
 ἠκούμων σκυτάλα Μοισᾶν, γλυκεῖς  
 κρητὴρ ἀναφθέγγτων ᾠδῶν.

In Pindar, says Mr. Paley, "the oral conveyance [of poems] by ἄγγελοι is often alluded to, and the words in Od. vi. 91 seem absolutely to admit of no other interpretation; for the poet there compares the person who is sent to impart the ode to a *scytale* or writing staff—a short wooden cylinder round which a paper was wrapped for penning brief messages. If the man carried with him the ode written, the comparison is utterly pointless. . . . It would be perfectly absurd to call an errand-boy a *note*, simply because he carried a note to a friend's house."<sup>15</sup>

The second passage (Pyth. iv. 277) is one which ends with the line—

αἴζεται καὶ Μοῖσα δι' ἄγγελίας ὀρθῶς.

i.e., "even the song itself is the better for being rightly reported" (Paley). Whatever be the precise connection of ideas between this line and those which precede it (a matter of some difficulty), the ode is certainly represented as being dependent upon ἄγγελία ὀρθῇ, which Mr. Paley and Mr. Fennell think can hardly have any other meaning than correct verbal repetition. And if this be the meaning of ὀρθῇ here, that of ὀρθῶς in the first passage quoted probably has the same signification. Our authors accordingly urge that these two passages tell very strongly against the notion that Pindar *wrote* his odes.

Other facts relied upon as tending to show the late introduction of writing are the following: (a) The clumsy and local characteristics of the uncial characters in inscriptions down to 450 B.C. Thus λ is found in five shapes, ξ in six, σ in four, χ in five, and so on. (As for the clumsiness, the writers of the inscriptions were not literary men but βανανοῖ, handicraftsmen of that servile class in whose ineradicable inferiority to the free citizen Aristotle so firmly believed.<sup>16</sup> The argument from local characteristics can be met *à pari* by a reference to the local differences of spelling which prevailed till much later

<sup>15</sup> Preface to Translation of Pindar's Odes.

<sup>16</sup> "Mr. Paley argues that as the potters of 500 B.C. did not spell Greek as he spells it, or use the modern letters, or write from left to right, therefore till after the death [?] of Pericles a written Iliad was impossible. Now people who are not experts can see that, if even potters could write a well-formed distinct hand in 500 B.C. . . . the Eupatridæ and the well-born poets might conceivably write an epic hundreds of years earlier" (A. Lang, in the *Academy*, March 8, pp. 216, 217).

times.) (b) The occurrence of boustrophedon inscriptions down to 460 B.C. (But these were instances of affected archaism, or rather perhaps a "survival" in epigraphic style.) (c) The late date of the first *written codes*. (Draco 620, Solon 590 B.C.) "Codes," says Sir H. Maine, "were certainly in the main a direct result of the invention of writing." (He also says that codes were extorted by the base-born from the higher caste, who would not be in a hurry to commit to writing the limitations of their privileges. The argument is too vague to stand alone.) (d) The fact that the early philosophers composed in verse. "Xenophanes, and Parmenides of Elea, and Empedocles of Sicily, also composed verses, which I think is evidence they did not *write*, as prose was far more suited to their themes than metre. Surely it was the necessity of aiding the memory in default of other manner of recording their sentiments, which led philosophers, and legislators too, according to what is said of Charondas (circ. 500), to confine their sentiments and injunctions to lines and feet. Philosophers of after times thought this practice worthy of imitation, and so gave rise to a body of didactic poetry. Hence the result of original disabilities is often considered a spontaneous effort and natural product of the Hellenic genius." (It may be answered, however, that memory required assistance so long as written treatises were difficult to obtain; which fact, combined with the tendency to "survival" perhaps sufficiently accounts for the practice of the early philosophers.)

But to return to Herodotus and Thucydides. In both cases I cannot but think that undue stress has been laid, or rather perhaps an erroneous interpretation fixed, upon the passages appealed to. Let us suppose for a moment that the work of Herodotus was, not indeed the first effort to write continuous prose, but the first effort to write a systematic history of events comparatively recent. Surely here were enough to justify the declaration above quoted of the purpose of the work. Only the other day a reviewer congratulated the English Dialect Society on its opportune efforts to rescue from oblivion a set of facts which are rapidly lapsing from the memory of man, fast becoming *ἐξίτηλα*. Just so Herodotus thought the exploits of the Greeks in the Persian War to be worthy of record. They were as yet unrecorded. He therefore came forward to rescue them from the oblivion which threatened them. Again, Thucydides' habitual appeals to *ἀκοή*, hearsay or tradition, seem to

me to resemble a modern writer's appeals to documents and records as contrasted with books easily accessible. As modern historians will make a point, not of having read Macaulay, but of having rummaged in the State Paper Office, so perhaps Thucydides, while slightly jealous of acknowledging his obligations to Herodotus, takes care to inform us that he had recourse to the *fontes*, the best sources of antiquarian information then available, namely human memory.

The ἄγγελοι of Pindar have, I think, received hard treatment at the hands of Mr. Paley and Mr. Fennel. The Pindaric ἄγγελος was essentially a *choir-leader*. His business was not to present Hiero or Agesias with an inscribed scroll of papyrus, but to lead a chorus in performing the ode in the victor's honour. (Imagine Haydn or Mozart sending the scroll of an orchestral piece to some royal personage instead of having the music executed in the presence!) This view (in which I find I have been anticipated by Mr. Holmes) Mr. Fennell considers far-fetched. I venture to say it is the only one which can stand the test of inquiry. Pindar's Epinician Odes were choral performances, intended to be executed at the festival which celebrated the victory which they commemorate. To present a written copy before the public performance would be like inviting the Prince of Wales to an undress rehearsal of a piece specially dedicated to his Royal Highness.<sup>17</sup> But if this be so there is ample scope for the interpretation of ἀγγελία ὀρθῇ without the extreme supposition that Pindar's Odes were unwritten.

The minor (supposed) indications of the late rise of a written Greek literature were briefly commented on above. But it is right to remark at this stage upon a seeming misconception which, if I rightly apprehend the matter, vitiates the whole of Mr. Paley's reasoning upon this subject. For the formation of a Homeric *textus receptus* he postulates "a reading age," an age in which there was a "demand for books." This is surely an exaggeration. Even supposing (what I should not admit) that our Iliad and Odyssey could have come into existence only as written poems, I maintain, with Mr. Mahaffy,

<sup>17</sup> "Has Mr. Paley forgotten that a Pindaric ode required special music and figured dancing—that the mere words were a mere libretto [?] of a mimic and musical performance? We might as well infer that if Wagner comes from Germany to England with an opera which he has written for the English public, he cannot have put it down in writing, but carries it in his head" (Mahaffy, in *Macmillan*, April, p. 526).

that "writing as a literary resource is quite sufficient to enable us to explain their composition;" and that "while Æschylus wrote his plays, the early Attic public may have been quite content to hear them, as they were content to hear the Epics recited." Why, then, "must we hold that the Iliad and Odyssey could not be composed till people wanted to have them in their hands and read them?"<sup>18</sup> But the case for the early use of writing for literary purposes, to an extent sufficient to provide reference copies,<sup>19</sup> at least, of works in both prose and poetry, stands on more positive grounds than any mere attempt to overthrow Mr. Paley's and Mr. Fennell's arguments on the opposite side. These grounds have been well stated by Dr. Hayman, from whose recent article on the subject in the *Journal of Philology* I draw most of what follows.

There does not seem to be any substantial ground for doubting the statements of Strabo, Pliny, and others that the three earliest prose writers in Greece were Cadmus of Miletus,<sup>20</sup> Pherecydes of Syros, and Hecataeus of Miletus. These three writers cover an epoch extending from about 550 to 480 B.C. Concerning Hecataeus, at least it seems difficult to doubt that he composed in writing a *Γῆς περίοδος*, or Circuit of the World. To this Herodotus makes repeated references of a character which forbid us to suppose that he is citing a mere oral account. Dr. Hayman is probably right in his conjecture that Æschylus' very noteworthy attempts to describe the geography of distant lands (especially in the *Prometheus Vincit* and in the lost *Prom. Solutus*) were based upon the "Circuit" of Hecataeus. Besides this, the significant fact that Æschylus treats the byblus or papyrus as the typical plant of Egypt, clothing with it "the Egyptian landscape of his fancy," even to the hills (*βυβλίνων ὄρων*, l. 811, compare *χρυσῶν ὄρων* of Persian hills in *Ar. Ach.* 82), testifies not merely to his acquaintance with the plant, but to his conception of it as a plentiful product of Egypt.

If, then, it be true that prose writing in Greek reaches back into the sixth century B.C., what is to be thought of written poetry? Dr. Hayman argues, I think, legitimately, when he says that the wealth of fragments which we still possess from the early lyrists and iambographists points unmistakeably to a

<sup>18</sup> *Macmillan*, April, p. 527.

<sup>19</sup> The so-called "civic editions" may, notwithstanding Wolf's criticisms, have been of this nature.

<sup>20</sup> Not to be confounded with the mythical founder of Thebes.

written literature. The body of verse of which these hundreds of fragments are the relics must have been so large that it seems impossible to suppose it handed down by merely oral tradition.<sup>21</sup> The fact that we have fragments of Phrynichus, but none of Thespis, may not improbably be accounted for on the supposition that the former wrote his plays, but not the latter.

That the Homeric text must have been settled at least a century earlier than Mr. Paley allows seems to be proved by the appeals made to it as a historical authority in the time of the Persian wars, and by the fact that commentations on the text of Homer formed the subject of lectures in the Athens of Plato's younger days.

Mr. Lang has rightly remarked that the question of the age of writing in Greece has been obscured by attention having been confined to Athens. Perhaps it is not an exaggeration to say that Ionia was a century ahead of continental Greece in this respect, and Cyprus *may* have been a century ahead of Ionia.

With one more remark this portion of the subject must be closed. No one is ignorant that the Greek alphabet is derived from the Phœnician. But not every one bears in mind that the oldest Greek letters known resemble more closely the Moabite characters of 1000—900 B.C. than the Phœnician characters of about 750 B.C. This has been stated by Dr. Hayman as the result of his own observation. It had been previously pointed out by Dr. Ginsburg, in his monograph on the Moabite Stone. It is true that this does not *prove* that Greek writing originated in 1000 B.C., since the Moabite may have co-existed with the Phœnician of the inscription of Eshmunazar (750 or 700) till much later times. Still it remains not a little remarkable that the old Greek writing approaches most closely to the oldest known Phœnician alphabet.

II. The somewhat elaborate argument which Mr. Paley founds upon the treatment of Trojan or Homeric subjects by Pindar and the tragic poets, seems to take for granted a postulate which abundant literary experience shows to be a misconception. His reasoning seems to proceed on the supposition that Pindar and the tragic poets, had our Homer been known to them, would not have deviated from his treatment of these

<sup>21</sup> For the handing down of an *epic* there seems to have been special provision in the guilds or families of rhapsodists.



incidents which they have in common with him. Homer, Mr. Paley seems to think, could not have been "the divine" to poets who so freely departed from his teachings. Was then Homer ever held "divine" in the sense that he was regarded by the poets who succeeded him as a peremptory historical authority? Or was the *Commedia* of Dante the less "divine" to Milton, because he adopted a different topography of Hell? For the light in which the poets of Greece regarded *their* Homer Pindar may be our witness.

ἐγὼ δὲ πλεόν' ἔλπομαι  
λόγον Ὀδυσσεύος ἢ πάθεν διὰ τὸν ἄδυεπ' ἑνέσθ' Ὀμηρον,  
ἐπεὶ ψεύδεσι οἱ ποταμφ' τε μηχανῶ  
σεμνὸν ἔπεσσι τι.<sup>22</sup>

How in the face of passages like these it can be put forward as matter of astonishment that Pindar and the tragic poets should venture to depart from the Homeric versions of the legends which they treated, passes my comprehension.

Mr. Paley further seems to suppose that had our Homer been known to the tragic poets of the Periclean age they would have chosen for their themes, by preference, those portions of the Homeric legend which had been treated by the poet of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, rather than those which had been left by him in comparative obscurity. The testimony of the history of literature is, I think, adverse to this view. How, in fact, do those poets who have treated of Trojan subjects whole centuries later than even the Homer of Mr. Paley's argument stand the test implied in that argument? Do they draw their inspiration mainly from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*? or do they rather try to supplement those poems, and for some reason unconfessed keep clear of what is for ever consecrated ground?<sup>23</sup> To take a single instance from modern poetry: What has been the procedure of our own laureate? Are his Ulysses, his Lotoseaters, his *Cenone* based upon our Homer, or are they "developments of Homeric hints?" To take a single instance from ancient poetry: What is the procedure of Quintus Smyrnaeus? Pindar, Mr. Paley thinks, could not have had our Homer in

<sup>22</sup> Nem. vii. 21. "Now I think that the reputation of Ulysses has become greater than his deeds would justify, through honey-tongued Homer; for his fictions and poetic flights have a plausible air."

<sup>23</sup> Consecrated, not in the sense that any superstitious feeling warns them off it (a notion of Mr. Mahaffy's which Mr. Paley rightly rejects), but in the sense that it is felt that to trespass on such ground after the master worker has taken possession is a sure road to adverse criticism and contempt.

view in the enumeration of the exploits of Achilles introduced into his seventh Isthmian ode. There the poet says: "The youthful valour of Achilles has been shown to such as proved it not, by the mouths of poets. 'Twas he who stained with blood the vine-clad plain of Mysia, sprinkling it with the dark gore of Telephus, who gave the Atridæ to return by a safe path across the sea; who delivered Helen, by disabling those heroes of Troy . . . the mighty Memnon, the haughty Hector, and other chieftains." It will be remembered that Telephus and Memnon have no place in our Homer. Now what is Quintus' enumeration of Achilles' exploits? He slew, we are told, Telephus, Cycnus, Hector, Penthesilea, and the son of Tithonus (*i.e.* Memnon).<sup>24</sup> None of these except Hector appear in our poems. If then the Pindaric passage goes to show that he did not possess our Iliad and Odyssey, what must we think of Quintus?

But in fact Aristotle had long ago satisfactorily accounted for the silence, such as it is, of the tragedians. Setting aside the process of expanding Homeric hints, or adopting Homeric episodes (as in the case of the *Cyclops*, the *Rhesus*, the *Ajax*), it is difficult to see how the main plot of the Iliad could supply the subject of more than one or two Tragedies. And beyond this there was that deeper reason which Mr. Paley thinks so weak, but of which M. Ozanam saw the force when he said: "Comme on ne refit jamais l'Eneide, la Jérusalem, les Lusiades, le Paradis perdu, jamais non plus on ne tenta de refaire l'Illiade, l'Odyssee, les Nibelungen. Quand le génie à touché à quelque chose, nul n'y retouche après lui."

There is, however, one passage in Pindar, and one statement made by Athenæus concerning Æschylus, which deserve more special notice. Athenæus says that Æschylus used to call his tragedies "slices from Homer's great feasts" (τεμάχη τῶν Ὀμήρου μεγάλων δείπνων). This is certainly puzzling, for the plays of our Æschylus assuredly can by no means be said to bear any such relation to our Homer. The only solution of the difficulty which suggests itself to me is that Æschylus followed the popular tradition, which attributed far more to Homer than the Iliad and Odyssey alone. In fact, as every one knows, Herodotus takes credit to himself for

<sup>24</sup> Q. Sm. xiv. 121—135. Somewhat curiously, as it seems to me, Mr. Paley quotes this very passage in an opposite sense to show that the Iliad of Homer and the Posthomericæ of Quintus are "both alike compilations from the same older sources" (*Homer and Quintus*, p. 26).

originality in the discovery that the Iliad and Odyssey alone were Homer's work. It might be observed by a defender of Mr. Paley's view that this is just what that scholar has contended for all along; that the Homer of Æschylus was a poet of far wider range than the poet of our Iliad and Odyssey. But then this by no means proves either that Æschylus did not possess, among other epics, our Iliad and Odyssey, or that he did not consider them superior to the other (supposed) works of the great poet.

In Pindar's fourth Pythian ode (v. 277), Homer is quoted as asserting that a noble (ἑσθλός) messenger confers honour on the business in which he is employed :

ἄγγελον ἐσλὸν ἔφα τιμὰν μεγίσταν πρᾶγματι παντὶ φέρειν.

This, Mr. Paley thinks, can hardly be a reference, as has been supposed, to Iliad xv. 207.

ἑσθλὸν καὶ τὸ τέτυκται, ὅτ' ἄγγελος αἶσιμα εἰδῆ.

"this too is a fine (ἑσθλόν) thing, when a messenger knows (*i.e.* brings) good tidings." It is, however, possible that the reference has arisen from a confusion in the mind or memory of Pindar, who has retained in prominence the words ἄγγελος and ἑσθλός of the Homeric line, but has materially altered the sense in which they are used. This is the view of Dr. Hayman, who cites in illustration the reference in—

Not the Volscians themselves made an exit more speedy  
From Corioli, fluttered like doves, by Macready,

to Shakespeare's

Like an eagle in dovescot, I  
Fluttered their Volsces in Corioli.

I am not clear that the illustration is in point, for here the essential construction seems to be retained. But whatever be thought of the illustration, if the view which it is invoked to support be unsatisfactory, we may take refuge in the theory that Pindar is referring perhaps to the Homer of the Cypria.

I will conclude the discussion of the relations of our Homer to the poets of the Periclean age with two quotations from Mr. Monro and Mr. Lang respectively. Mr. Monro writes :

On the question of the period at which the Iliad and Odyssey received their present form, Mr. Paley is of course *ultra*-Wolfian. But his view of the relation of the Iliad and Odyssey to the pre-existing materials is not at all Wolfian. He recognizes, not a Pisistratus or arranger of lays, but '*unius auctoris consilium*' [the italics are Mr. Paley's]

qui veterum rhapsodorum narrationibus libere usus,' &c. His whole argument turns on the supposition that a great poet arose, who recast the whole story, invented many incidents unknown to the other "Cyclic" poems, and described characters of a new and elevated type. That such a poet should have arisen . . . late in the fifth century B.C., and yet that he should have been so utterly unknown that his work passed for the oldest of all poetry, is surely improbable in the highest degree."<sup>25</sup>

But the strangest thing of all is the principle on which, according to Mr. Paley's suppositions, the recasting process must have been performed. Mr. Lang observes, speaking of this part of the subject:

Here Mr. Paley's argument becomes, to my mind, really amazing. Till after the death of Pericles there was [according to him] no demand for books. People were satisfied with the floating lays which rhapsodists recited. From these lays the dramatists chose topics, the vase-painters selected subjects. These subjects were not those of which we read in our Homer. Our Homer's themes [Mr. Paley insists] were almost unknown. Then came the demand for the *textus receptus* of well-known lays; and how was it made? Why, by compiling all the incidents that no one had ever heard of, and omitting all that had long been familiar to everybody? by doing this, by "compiling" our Iliad and Odyssey "no very wonderful performance," the "diaskeuast" threw all the old poems into the shade. Strange as it may seem, this is Mr. Paley's argument."<sup>26</sup>

III. The argument drawn from the Greek vases would hardly be relied on by any one who gives up the reasoning grounded on the treatment of Homeric subjects by Pindar and the tragic poets. It has been, perhaps, sufficiently dealt with by Dr. Hayman. Briefly it may be observed that the small proportion which subjects taken from our Iliad and Odyssey bear to the entire number treated in vase-paintings and other works of art may be accounted for by the preponderating influence which local associations, legends, and superstitions would have in determining the choice subjects for representation. On the decay of these superstitions with the advance of "civilization," literary subjects, themes consecrated by celebration in the most esteemed works, would begin to have precedence. And this is just what we find. Dr. Birch tells us that on the later vases subjects taken from our Homer become more common than in the earlier specimens.

HERBERT W. LUCAS.

<sup>25</sup> *Academy*, October 19, 1878, p. 385.

<sup>26</sup> *Academy*, March 8, 1879, p. 217.

### *Some Notes on the Assyrian and Babylonian Gods.*

---

WHEN the Jews were led away captives into Babylon by Nabuchodonosor, the holy Prophet Jeremias sent to them an epistle by his scribe Baruch warning them against the idolatry, which they would see in the country of Babylon. He addresses them thus: "You shall see in Babylon gods of gold, and of silver, and of stone, and of wood borne upon shoulders, causing fear to the Gentiles. Beware therefore that you imitate not the doings of others, and be afraid, and the fear of them should seize upon you. But when you see the multitude behind, and before adoring them, say you in your hearts: Thou oughtest to be adored, O Lord."<sup>1</sup> And then the inspired Prophet, in his zeal for the purity of the one true religion, describes the weakness and feebleness of the heathen gods in a manner well-fitted to destroy all possibility of confidence in them. These, and similar denunciations which are found in the Bible, together with some incidental passages occurring in the classical authors of Greece and Rome, were the only sources of information about the Assyrian and Babylonian mythology before the discovery and explanation of the cuneiform inscriptions. But even when it had become possible to explain the arrow-headed inscriptions for historical purposes, great difficulties still attended the endeavour to decipher with certainty the proper names of persons and places in Babylonia. These difficulties originated in the strange manner of writing the proper names of the gods and of historical personages with so-called ideograms; at last it was discovered that all these names not phonetically written really were not Assyrian, but Chaldean or, as scholars now call them Sumerian or Aecadian. With this discovery of a new language elsewhere quite unknown, many difficulties of the Assyrian inscriptions could be solved at once. It was soon found out that the so-called syllabaries were really dictionaries for both languages, Assyrian

<sup>1</sup> Baruch vi. 3—5.

and Accadian, and that several of them were translations of old religious or legal texts. By this means a whole civilization, anterior to the Semitic civilization in Mesopotamia and Chaldea, was discovered, the inheritance or achievement of a Turanian people to whom the invention of the cuneiform writing itself is due. This people, as it seems, reached a relatively high degree of civilization and exercised a great deal of influence over the Semitic races in Mesopotamia. To this cause must be ascribed the frequent use of foreign words in the historical inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia, the difficulty in reading the proper names in Assyrian, which commonly are written in Accadian, and the occurrence of so many unusual expressions and ideas in the Assyrian inscriptions, which for a long time were very perplexing to many scholars.

Even now, although many Assyrian texts have been translated, very few attempts have been made to collect the different passages containing mythological allusions, and none whatever, as far as we know, to reduce to a system the mythology of either the Babylonians or the Assyrians. There are indeed some works in which the remarks of the classical authors on this subject may be studied, as in the collection of Selden: *De Diis Syris*; or of Hyde: *Veterum Persarum et Parthorum et Medorum religionis historia*, etc.; but a complete series of mythological extracts from the cuneiform inscriptions has not yet been attempted. The notes on Babylonian mythology still lie scattered in various commentaries on historical inscriptions, in incidental passages of works where nobody would expect to find them, in short appendices to historical treatises and the like. Scholars still continue to call the same god by three or four different names, so that no one can recognize the identity in translations such as are given, for instance, in the *Records of the Past*, without first comparing them with the original texts. Although whole mythological legends have been translated, yet many texts are still unpublished, which it will be necessary to compare before it is possible to establish a system of mythology with any degree of security. Such a work, prepared by an able Assyrian scholar, would be of the highest interest to all who seek to know the history of religious ideas in Asia in the earlier times, and it would certainly shed new light on many biblical questions. In the actual state of Assyrian studies such an enterprise is still impossible, but even such scanty remarks on this subject as



can be offered now may be not altogether without interest. I propose in the following pages to make some few extracts from the cuneiform inscriptions in reference to the Assyrian and Babylonian gods, in the hope that these may lead to further investigations.

No one who examines the monumental records of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings can fail to remark the frequent mention of the gods, or avoid the conclusion that these ancient monarchs, at least in their public records, were in their own way exceedingly pious and devout. This fact may be explained by considering the nature and the origin of those inscriptions, which for the most part are inscribed on cylinders placed in the foundations of temples or other religious and public buildings and deposited probably with sacred ceremonies. Many of these literary fragments have been found in tombs, where they were put for religious purposes. This, at all events, we learn, that the ordinary life of these nations of Mesopotamia was mixed up with many acts of worship, and that in those ancient times atheism was practically unknown. We might arrive at the same result by studying the biblical account; for the Prophets of Juda do not warn the Jews against atheism but against the superstitious usages and the idolatry of the pagans dwelling in adjacent countries. In 4 Kings xvii. we read that even many of the chosen people, who were carried away captives by Salmanasar into Assyria and Media, were seduced by the example of the pagans into the practice of the most abominable idolatry. Such a fact shows indeed, that these idolatrous rites were very common and frequent and at the same time most attractive.

In almost all public records of any importance, we find in the beginning an invocation of the so-called "great gods," who are invited to protect the king, or to whom thanks are expressed for their help and their favour. The number of these great gods varies in the different inscriptions, and it seems that every one could choose and invoke as many as he liked, and the importance of the matter required. Thus we read in an inscription of Esarhaddon (about B.C. 689—667): "To the god Assur, Sin (the Moon-god), Samas (Sun-god), Bel, Nabu (Nebo) and Nergal, Istar of Ninive and Istar of Arbela I lifted up my hands, and they accepted my prayer."<sup>2</sup> In another inscription

<sup>2</sup> Cylinder of Esarhaddon in III. R. 15, col. I. l. 4, "a-na ilu As-sur, ilu Sin, ilu Samas, ilu Bel, ilu Nabu u ilu Nergal, ilat Istar sa Ninua-ki ilat Istar sa ir Arba-ilu qa-a-ti as-si va im-gu-ru ki-bi-ti."

the same King attests his piety towards the gods, saying: "(Assur-akh-iddin . . . who in the service of Assur, Bel) the god Sin, the god Samas, Nabu, Marduk, Istar of Ninive, Istar of Arbela, the great gods his lords, from the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun, marched without a rival."<sup>3</sup> The Babylonian King Nabunahid (about B.C. 556—541) calls himself in his inscription: "Worshipping the great gods."<sup>4</sup> Tiglathpileser the Second (about B.C. 745—727) says in his annals of himself: "The King, who in the name of Assur, Samas, and Marduk, the great gods, from the sea of Bit-Yakin (the Persian Gulf) unto the country of Bikni in the East . . . ruled over countries, and exercised royal power over them."<sup>5</sup> Shalmaneser the Second (about B.C. 865—830) speaks of the great gods in these terms in his inscription, found at Kurkh: "Assur, the great Lord, King of all the great gods; Anu, King of the great spirits of heaven and earth, Lord of the countries; Bel, the father of the gods, the determiner of destinies, the assembler of solemn assemblies . . . Hea, the leader (?), King of the abyss of chaos, the administrator of the benefits (?) of heaven and earth, the ruler (?); Samas, the judge of the superior regions (?) . . . and of mankind; Istar, Queen of war and battle, who glorifies valour (?) . . . the great gods, the promoters of my kingly power."<sup>6</sup> In a similar way Tiglathpileser the First (about B.C. 1110—1100) mentions in his cylinder the different titles of the great gods whom he particularly worshipped.<sup>7</sup> Besides these and other historical texts a different kind of monument is still preserved to us, viz., the so-called despatch-tablets, or letters to the Assyrian monarchs and other high officers. These texts are all composed in an official style, probably prescribed by the etiquette of the Assyrian Court. After the usual address follows invariably an invocation of various gods, whose favour is sought for the King or to the recipient of the letter. One

<sup>3</sup> Cyl. Esarhaddon in I. R. 45, col. 1, l. 4, " . . . ilu Sin, ilu Samas, ilu Nabu, ilu Marduk, ilat Istar sa Ninua-ki, ilat Istar sa Arba-ilu-ki, ilani rabuti belu-su ul-tu tsi-it sam-si a-di e-rib sam-si it-tal-lak-u-va ma-khi-ra la i-su-u."

<sup>4</sup> I. R. 68, col. 1, l. 4, "pa-likh ilani rabuti a-na-ku."

<sup>5</sup> II. R. 67, l. 3, "Sarru sa ina zi-kir Assur, ilu Sa-mas u ilu Marduk, ilani rabuti ultu nahar mar-ra-ti sa Bit-Ya-ki-ni a-di mat Bi-ik-ni sa napakh sam-si . . . matâti i-pi-lu-va e-bu-su sar-ru-s'i-in."

<sup>6</sup> III. R. 7, l. 1, "Ilu A-sur belu rab-u sar kim-rat ilani rabuti, ilu A-nu, sar an-nun rabuti u an-A-nun-na-ki, bel matâti, ilu Bel, abu ilani mu-sim simâti, mu-tsir e-tsu-rat . . . tim, ilu Hea ir-su, sar zu-ab ba-u, nik . . . te-ni (?) -se-e-ti, ilat Istar bi-lat qabal u takhaz sa me-lul-ta sa tuqmat . . . ilani rabuti naram- . . . sarruti-ya."

<sup>7</sup> I. R. 9, l. 1—15.

of solemn import may be sufficient to give an idea of these memorials. In a letter addressed to the King by Bin-sum-utsur it is said: "The god Assur, Sin, Samas, Bin, . . . , . . . , Bel, Marduk, . . . , Nabu, Tasmituv, . . . the Queen of Kitmuri, . . . (Istar) of Arbela, Ninip, . . . Nergal, Laz, the gods of heaven and earth, the gods dwelling in the country of Akkad, all the gods of the world—[the rest is broken, viz., May they be propitious to the King]."<sup>8</sup> Other letters of lesser importance mention only two or three different gods, *v.g.* "Nabu, Marduk, may they be propitious to the King my lord,"<sup>9</sup> or, "Bel, Nabu, Ninip, and Nusku, may they be propitious to the King, my lord,"<sup>10</sup> or, "Assur, Samas, Bel, Nabu, may they be propitious to the King my lord,"<sup>11</sup> or, "Bel, Nabu, Istar of Niniveh, and Istar of the temple Kidimuri may they be favourable and gracious and propitious to the King my lord."<sup>12</sup> From these examples we may conclude that the old Assyrians invoked their gods frequently, and ascribed to them all their success, both in their daily life and in their military and political affairs. The number of gods commonly invoked varied from two to sixteen, and perhaps more, probably according to the importance of the affair recommended to their favour. Of course a far greater number of gods are mentioned in the mythological tablets, but these still require careful study, and will continue to be very difficult to interpret, until the principles of Assyrian mythology are ascertained.

To the great gods the accession to the throne is commonly ascribed; thus we read in the cylinder of Esarhaddon: "Assur, Samas, Bel and Nabu, Istar of Niniveh and Istar of Arbela have seated me happily on the throne, and have intrusted to me the dominion over the country."<sup>13</sup> The great gods are considered to assist the King in war, and in the battle, as Esarhaddon states: "Assur Samas, Bel and Nebo,

<sup>8</sup> An unpublished clay tablet of the British Museum, marked, R. 601, l. 7—17.

<sup>9</sup> Unpublished letter of Belbasa to the King, in the British Museum, marked K. 613, l. 3, 4.

<sup>10</sup> An unpublished letter to the King in the British Museum, marked K. 517, l. 3, 4.

<sup>11</sup> Unpublished letter of Nabûa to the King, in the British Museum, marked K. 481, l. 4—6.

<sup>12</sup> Unpublished letter of Rimnabu to the King, in the British Museum, marked K. 11. l. 4—7.

<sup>13</sup> Cyl. Esarhaddon in III. R. 15, col. 2, l. 5, "Ilu As-sur, ilu Samas, ilu Bel u ilu Nabu, ilat Istar sa Ninua-ki, ilat Istar sa ir Arba-ilu ya-a-ti Assur-akh-jiddin ina kus's'u abi-ya da-bis u-se-si-bu-ni-ma bi-lut mat u-sad-gi-lu pa-ni-ya."

Istar of Niniveh and Istar of Arbela have strengthened me with power against my enemies."<sup>14</sup> Assurbanipal (about B.C. 667—647) expresses his thanks to the great gods for his victory over Ammuladi, King of Kidri (Kedar): "In the service of Assur, Sin, Samas, Bin, Bel, Nebo, Istar of Niniveh, the Queen of Kitmuri, Istar of Arbela, Ninip, Nergal, Nusku . . . I accomplished his overthrow."<sup>15</sup> It seems clear from the few quotations which we have given, that these ancient nations were much attached to the service of their gods, and in this historical fact we find an explanation of the strange facility with which the people of God permitted itself to be seduced by the idolatry of heathen neighbours. At that time people did not apostatize from the true religion to atheism, but they exchanged their own religious laws and practices for the superstitious and more sensuous and sensual practices of the nations around them. The Assyrians and Babylonians, however, were not satisfied with giving expressions to their religious feelings towards the "great gods" only in words. We learn from the inscriptions that they celebrated many feasts in their honour, and observed many religious rites on various great occasions. A few examples may suffice to show how much of religion was introduced into daily life.

Almost every king of whom any notice has come down to us, says in the beginning of each campaign that he is marching against his enemies in the name, or in the service of the god Assur, or of the great gods. King Sargon attributes his victories to the great gods: "By the strength and power of the great gods, my lords, who have assisted my arms I overwhelmed the resistance of my enemies."<sup>16</sup> Tiglathpileser the First says: "I went to the country S'ugi in Gilkhi, which was not submissive to the god Assur, my lord, by the high command of god Assur."<sup>17</sup> The enemies are commonly described

<sup>14</sup> Cyl. Esarhaddon in I. R. 46. col. iv. l. 38, "Ilu As-sur, ilu Samas, ilu Bel u ilu Nabu, ilat Istar sa Ninua-ki, ilat Istar sa Arba-ilu-ki eli na-ki-ri-ya ina li-i-ti u-sa-zi-zu-ni-va."

<sup>15</sup> Cyl. of Assurbanipal in III. R. 24. col. viii. l. 24, "Ina tugul-ti, ilu Assur, ilu Sin, ilu Samas, ilu Bin (or, Vul, Im, etc), ilu Bel, ilu Nabu, ilat Istar sa Ninua-ki, ilat Sar-rat Kit-mu-ri, ilat Istar sa Arba-ilu-ki, ilu Adar (or Ninip), ilu Nirgal, ilu Nusku apikta-su as-kun." Compare col. x. l. 16 and l. 41.

<sup>16</sup> Fastes de Sargon, l. 16, "I-na li-i-ti u da-na-ni sa ilani rabuti beli-ya sa kakk-ya u-sat-bu-va u-ra-as'-s'i-ba na-gab ga-ri-ya."

<sup>17</sup> Cyl. Tiglathpileser the First in I. R. 12. col. iv. l. 7, "I-na gibis e-mu-qi sa ilu A-sur beli-ya a-na mat S'ugi sa mat Gil-khi la ka-ni-su-ut ilu A-sur beli-ya lu al-lik."

as overwhelmed by the fear of god Assur, as Tiglathpileser the Second states of Merodach-baladan: "Exceeding fear of Assur, my lord, overwhelmed him, and he came to the city S'apiya before me, and kissed my feet."<sup>18</sup> After a victorious battle or a successful campaign sacrifices to the gods are offered, as the same King records after his campaign to Babylonia: "Noble sacrifices I offered to the god Bel, Zirbanitu, Nabu, Tasmituv, Nergal, Laz, the great gods, my lords."<sup>19</sup> In the countries of the conquered nations statues of the Assyrian monarchs were erected, and the praises of the god Assur or of the great gods are inscribed on them; thus we read in the annals of Samas-Bin (or Samas-Rimmon, also called Samsi-Vul, Samsi-Hu, &c., about B.C. 830—817), where he describes his campaign to the country Girubbunda: "An image of my great majesty I made; the praises of Assur, my lord . . . I wrote upon it."<sup>20</sup> Such a solemn act was certainly not without religious rites, and we may be sure that the description of the Prophet Daniel<sup>21</sup> gives an accurate account of all similar solemnities. "King Nabuchodonosor made a statue of gold . . . and he set it up in the plain of Dura of the province of Babylon. . . . Then the nobles, the magistrates, and the judges, the captains and rulers, the great men that were placed in authority, and all the princes of the provinces, were gathered together to come to the dedication of the statue, which King Nabuchodonosor had set up. And they stood before the statue . . . Then a herald cried with a strong voice: To you it is commanded, O nations, tribes, and languages: That in the hour that you shall hear the sound of the trumpet and of the flute and of the harp, of the sackbut, and of the psaltery, and of the symphony, and of all kind of music: ye fall down and adore the golden statue which King Nabuchodonosor hath set up." This fact, related by the Bible, was always considered as a token of the most excessive pride of this Babylonian monarch; by the cuneiform inscriptions, however, we learn, that this was not a single fact, but that almost all Assyrian and Babylonian kings

<sup>18</sup> Inscription of Tiglathpileser the Second in II. R. 67, l. 27, "Pul-khi me-lav-ve sa As-sur beli-ya is'-khu-bu-su-va a-na ir S'a-pi-ya a-di makh-ri-ya il-li-kav-va u-na-as-si-qa sepä-ya."

<sup>19</sup> Inscription of Tiglathpileser the Second in II. R. 67, l. 12, "Niqi elluti a-na ilu Bel, ilu Zir-bani-ti, ilu Nabu, ilat Tas-me-tuv, ilu Nergal, ilu La-az, ilani rabuti beli-ya ak-ki-va."

<sup>20</sup> Inscription of Samas-Rimmon in I. R. 33, col. iii. l. 20, "Za-lam sarru-ti-a sur-ba ebu-su li-ta-at Assur beli-ya . . . ina kir-bi-su al-tu-ur."

<sup>21</sup> Cap. iii.

erected their statues in the conquered countries, and probably with the same solemnities.

Other religious ceremonies were performed by the Assyrians in honour of their gods on occasion of the foundation of temples and palaces. It is a well known fact, that every king who erected a religious building of any importance placed in the four corners a dedicatory inscription on a prism, or cylinder, or barrel, with an account of the events of his own reign. Many of these cylinders and barrel-inscriptions have been found by the excavators in different places of Mesopotamia, as even lately a cylinder of Sennacherib discovered by Mr. H. Rassám and several barrel-cylinders of Nebukadnezzar. These inscriptions are all written in a very concise style, recording the different campaigns of the King of that time and exhibiting an account of the buildings erected by him. Tiglathpileser the First in his inscription mentions this ceremony thus: "The praises of my campaigns, the glories of my battles and the victories over enemies despising the god Assur, which Anu and Bin have granted to my expeditions, I have inscribed on tablets and cylinders, and I have placed them in the temple of Assur and Bin (or Rimmon, or Vul), the great gods, my lords for future days, and the inscribed tablets of Samsi-Bin, my ancestor, I have raised altars (?) and sacrificed victims (before them), and set them up in their places."<sup>22</sup> Sargon, after having described the different buildings in Dur-Sarkayan, the modern Khorsábád N.E. of Mossul, states that he sacrificed in the presence of the gods and the god Assur.<sup>23</sup> Assurbanipal (about B.C. 667—647) gives in his splendid cylinder a similar account of his building the palace called Bitriduti: "Sacrifices and libations (?) I offered to the gods, my lords; with convenient joy I completed it; I entered into it in a state palanquin (?). In after days, among the kings, my sons, whomsoever Assur and Istar to the dominion of the country and people shall proclaim his name; when this Riduti becomes old and decays, its decay he shall repair, the inscription written of my name my father's and my grandfather's, the remote descendant . . . may he see and an altar may he raise, sacrifices and libations

<sup>22</sup> Inscription of Tiglathpileser I. in I.R. 16, col. viii. l. 39: "Li-ta-at gur-di-ya ir-nin-tu tam-kha-ri-ya u sa-nu-us' nakiri za-e-ru-ut ilu Asur, sa ilu A-nu ua ilu Bin a-na si-tsu-ti is-ru-ku-u-ni i-na nare-ya ua tim-me-ni-ya al-dhu-ur i-na bit ilu A-nuv ua ilu Bin ilani rabuti beli-ya a-na za-at yume u-kin ua nare sa Samsi-Bin a-bi-ya a-zalli (*i.e.*, a-ni-mes) ab-su-us', niqi aq-qi, a-na as-ri-su-nu u-tir."

<sup>23</sup> *Fastes de Sargon*, l. 173, "Ma-khar-su-un ak-ki."



may he pour out and with the inscription written of his name may he place."<sup>24</sup>

Another, but probably similar, kind of religious rite was performed in erecting boundary stones. Several of them have been preserved to us from Babylonia. They contain mythological representations of the gods under whose protection the boundaries of an estate were placed, and who were invoked in the accompanying inscription to curse every one who should alter the limits unjustly. Thus we read in an inscription of Merodach-baladan (probably from the fourteenth century B.C.) after a minute description of the extent of an estate and the announcement of the name of its owner, Marduk-zakir-sum (or Marduk-sum-izkur) and his pedigree: "Whosoever, even the son of the owner of this field, shall act falsely, or shall make act wrongly, or into water, into fire shall cast it (the boundary stone), or into the earth shall bury it, and from the hand of Marduk-zakir-sum or his descendants shall remove it . . . may the gods Bel, Hea, Ninip, and the goddess Gula, the lords of this land, and all gods whose names are made known on this monument, violently execrate his name and with unspeakable curse may they curse him."<sup>25</sup>

From the old Babylonian kings several short inscriptions have been preserved to us, which were found on the bricks in the foundations of temples. These Babylonian bricks from Mugheir, Senkereh, Niffer, Warkah, Abu-Shahreïn, Zerghul, Akerkuf, and other Babylonian places give testimony to us of the reverence for the gods entertained by the rulers of the early Babylonian Empire. They refer almost all to the building of temples, and they show us, that in those ancient times many temples existed, and that religious worship received great attention. An inscription of the most ancient King of Babylonia, found at Mugheir, states: "Likbagas (or Uruk), King of the country Urunu (that is, the modern Mugheir, near the banks

<sup>24</sup> Cylinder A of Assurbanipal in III. R. 26. col. X. l. 96, "Niqi tas-ri-ikh-ti aq-qa-a a-na ilani beli-ya, ina khidati ri-sa-a-ti u-sar-ri-su, e-ru-ub ki-rib-su ina za-rat tak-ni-e; a-na arkat yume ina sarrani abli-ya, sa ilu Assur u ilat Istar a-na bi-lut mati ua nisi i-nam-bu-u zi-kir-su; e-nu-va bit riduti (or, bit us'-u-ti) su-a-tu i-lab-bi-ru-u-va in-na-khu, an-khu-us'-s'u lu-ud-dis, mu-sar-u si-dhir sumi-ya abi-ya, ziru da-ru-u sa . . . li-e-mur-va, kisal lub-su-us, niqii liti-ki (?), it-ti mu-sar-e si-dhir sumu-su si-kun.

<sup>25</sup> Inscription of Merodach-baladan in IV. R. 41, col. I. 14, "Lu ma-am-ma-na lu habal bel ekil su-a-tiv u-sa-aq-qa-ru i-na-ak-ka-ru a-na mie a-na isati u-sad-da-u, i-na irsi-ti i-qab-bi-ru, i-na qati Marduk-zakir-sum ua zir-su u-tu-tsu-u . . . ilani ma-la i-na naru su-a-tuv es-ri-tu-su-nu ud-da-a iz-zi-is lik-kil sumu-su, ar-rat la pa-sa-ri li-ru-ru-su."

372 *Some Notes on the Assyrian and Babylonian Gods.*

of the Euphrates in Southern Babylonia, where the brick was found), who built the temple of Ur (the Moon-god)."<sup>26</sup> The temples were dedicated principally to the Moon-god (Sin), the Sun-god (Samas), the god of war (Nergal), Bel, the goddess Nana, and Bilit (Beltis). As these countries in South Babylonia are relatively very little explored, we may presume that many remains of ancient foundations still await discovery, and it is probable that in those ancient times of the early Babylonian Empire (about 2000 B.C.) every town, to say the least, had a special temple and particular religious rites. The religious schools which were certainly in later times attached to these temples probably had their foundation in the earliest period of the Babylonian Empire, and, as Greek writers even assert that the teaching comes down from before the Deluge, we may fairly infer that extreme care was taken in the preservation and transmission of traditional knowledge. It would naturally be a point of honour with the Babylonian Kings in later centuries to restore and embellish the various temples built by their ancestors. It would even seem that they took more care to preserve the memory of their fidelity in repairing the temples than to secure to future times due knowledge of their military expeditions. It is, at least, a curious fact, that amongst all the inscriptions of Nebukadrezzar (except one very small historical fragment), of Neriglissor and Nabunahid there is no account of any military expedition, and that all these later Babylonian inscriptions on cylinders and barrels refer only to the building and repairing of temples. The cuneiform inscriptions certainly help to make us understand in what sense we are to take passages of the Bible like this: "The king also worshipped him (the god Bel) and went every day to adore him."<sup>27</sup>

The honour paid by the Babylonians and Assyrians to their gods is also shown by the practice, which they share with almost all the Semitic nations, of bestowing upon their children names formed from the names of their gods. In the same manner as the name of Jehovah commonly forms part of the Hebrew proper names, so the Assyrians and Babylonians adopted names which were intended to indicate their attachment to a certain god. Again a few examples must be given: Ismedagan signifies the god Dagon has heard; Assur-uballat,

<sup>26</sup> In I. R. i. n. I. 1, "Uruk sar Uru sa bit Sin ibnu;" or read in Accadian, "Likbagas, ungal Urunki-ma, mulu é an Uru-ki in-rû-a."

<sup>27</sup> Daniel xiv. 3.

Assur has given life; Assur-nazir-pal, Assur protects the son; Assur-nirari, Assur is my help; Sin-akhe-irba, the Moon-god has multiplied the brothers; Esarhaddon, Assur has given a brother; Nebukadnezzar, Nabu protects the (or my) crown. From this manner of compounding the proper names, it seems that in those Pagan nations children were dedicated from their birth to the protection of a certain god, probably the only god specially worshipped in a certain district. A more searching inquiry into the formation of the Assyrian proper names may throw much light upon several mythological and theological questions, especially if care be taken to preclude all undue influence of preconceived ideas.

These few notes will be enough to prove that from the careful collation of different cuneiform texts it is reasonable to expect the better elucidation of many important points of Oriental mythology, and that from a study of the historical monuments sure principles may be established for the satisfactory interpretation of the numerous mythological and magical inscriptions, which have been till now only partially published and still need all the aids derivable from scientific and philological research. At the same time, a fuller knowledge will be gained of the significance of the curious and interesting mythological representations which the sculptures from the temples of Nineveh have made familiar to all visitors of the British Museum.

J. N. STRASSMAIER.

### *Mr. Gladstone on Probabilism.*

---

IT is much to be wished that some trained theologian would give us a popular explanation of the Catholic aspect of Bishop Butler's great argument in the *Analogy*, as also of the relation of that argument to the Catholic theory of faith and of the Christian demonstration. No one can doubt, either the immense service rendered by the author of the *Analogy* to revealed religion, or the very great hold which his work has had upon the minds of the most thoughtful Englishmen for a century and a half. But it is also clear that the argument needs commentary and completion, in order that its full weight in favour of Catholicity may be appreciated. For its full weight, as I believe, presses as strongly in favour of Catholicism as such, as of revealed religion as such—there being, in Catholic eyes, no distinction between the two except a merely subjective distinction. I believe that the true and logical issue of the argument of the *Analogy* is in submission to the Catholic Church, not merely in submission, in a vague way, to Christianity as a revealed religion. On the other hand, even unlearned Catholics know that their faith is not meant to rest on only probable evidence, that its dogmas are far more certain than anything that we can learn from our senses or even than the axiomatic conclusions of the mind in the sphere of mathematical truth. The argument of Butler is one for the consideration of the grounds of faith, and it assumes Natural Religion as true. It is not an analysis of the assent of faith itself. But all this needs to be explained, and till this is done, people will be in danger of making attempts like that made by the late Mr. Keble, to justify resistance on grounds of probability to the positive authority of the Catholic Church, without regard to the explicit enactments of our Lord, such as those relating to unity and orthodoxy, or even of seeming to underrate the force of the

Christian evidences and grounds of faith until they are reduced to simple probabilities.

The occasion of these remarks is the late article of Mr. Gladstone in the *Nineteenth Century*, in which that distinguished writer appears, if one may say so, to be somewhat at sea in his theology. Catholics are always glad to find Mr. Gladstone writing so earnestly and thoughtfully as in the present instance on the most serious questions on which the human mind can occupy itself. They cannot doubt that he is honestly bent on helping on the great cause of faith and religious truth, that he is most truly desirous of taking part in the defence of the faith at a time when it is so frequently assailed in the organs of popular literature. The article which he has lately published may remind us of another which appeared in the same pages a few months back, in which Mr. Gladstone appeared to more than one of us to have in some respects drifted from the very hostile position towards the Church, which he had taken up in his well-known pamphlet about the Vatican Decrees. In the present article, also, it will strike many readers that he is seeking for something which he has not found in the matter of truth. He is giving a reason, in some respects, for the faith that is in him, and if his account is somewhat uncertain and unsatisfactory, it must at least be acknowledged that his heart is evidently on the side of faith and of religion. Catholics can wish him nothing better than that his views may become more clear and more certain. Every step which he may make in this direction will, they may venture to assure him, bring him nearer to the Catholic Church, far as he may now think himself to be from her, and hazardous as some of his statements may appear to her theologians.

This is not the time to enter on an examination of the article in detail, nor indeed do I intend to speak at any length on the main subject to which it is devoted. It is enough to say that, to a Catholic eye, Mr. Gladstone seems to confound the sphere of speculation with the sphere of action in his estimate of the universal reign, so to speak, of probability. He seems almost, if not quite, to admit that it is not more than probable that a revelation has been made to man, and it would not be very easy to give a satisfactory account of his theory as to the assent of faith itself. These are matters which would have to be very seriously dealt with in the case of a writer inside the Church, and it would hardly be fair, in the case of such a writer,

to throw out, even so far as has been done, hints of doubt as to the orthodoxy of his statements on points of such immense moment, without at the same time going into the question at least far enough to justify the surmises which have been made. In the case of Mr. Gladstone, however, Catholic writers are glad, in the first place, to treat him as a man who has in all good faith taken up theological subjects without theological training, a man whose face is towards the truth, although his manner of speaking may be uncouth and inadequate, not to say erroneous. Again, the present writer is not the first to express the surmises which have just now been mentioned. The small amount of space to which this paper is limited will be quite sufficiently occupied by the single subject to which it is devoted.

The point in Mr. Gladstone's article to which these few present pages refer is that in which he deals with the theory or doctrine which goes by the name of Probabilism. As to this, it is not too much to say that he has spoken without that acquaintance with the subject of his discourse which he usually brings to the handling of any subject whatever, of the very numerous departments of human thoughts on which he favours the world with his conclusions. He appears to be no better acquainted with moral theology than the ordinary run of Members of the House of Commons. It would have quite been possible for Mr. Gladstone to say all that he has said in commendation of the argument from Probability without touching the subject of Probabilism in its technical sense. But if it was necessary to touch that subject, it surely would have been better to ascertain what those who are familiar with it think and say about it. Mr. Gladstone's ideas about Probabilism seem to have been formed from two sources—from the notoriously unfaithful picture given of it by Pascal, and from his own, apparently very cursory, study of a French *Manuel des Confesseurs*. As to this latter work, no complaint can be made, except that no Catholic priest could ever be supposed to be capable of speaking with authority, or of conducting a discussion on the subject of Probabilism, who had merely read for himself what is there to be found. These subjects are treated in lectures in Catholic Colleges, and it is in that way only that a full mastery of them can be obtained. As for Pascal, his book is about equally a masterpiece in French writing and in unprincipled misrepresentation. He has been exposed over and over again, and Mr. Gladstone must have had many opportunities



of reading the exposures.<sup>1</sup> The only excuse that can be made for him is that he was supplied with the quotations by others, and did not know his authors. He says himself in one place, with singular ingenuousness, that after he had written his attack on certain writers, he read what he had been attacking.

But let us hear Mr. Gladstone's own account of Probabilism, and the other systems by which it is, as he says, "confronted." In the earlier part of his article Mr. Gladstone tells us that the doctrine of Probabilism is that "it is allowable, in matters of moral conduct, that if of two opposite opinions each one be sustained, not by a slight, but by a solid, probability, and if the probability of the one is admittedly more solid than that of the other, we may follow our natural liberty of choice by acting on the less probable."<sup>2</sup> Later on, Mr. Gladstone states that this doctrine "is confronted by a system called Probabiliorism, which teaches that, when in doubt among several alternatives of conduct, we are bound to choose that which has the greatest likelihood of being right. And there is also, it appears, a rigid school of those who pass by the name of Tutorists. *These hold that even such likelihood is insufficient, and that certainty is required as a warrant for our acts.*"<sup>3</sup> We have italicized this last passage, because it will convey to those versed in the subject a fair idea of the amount of misconception of which a clever man is capable when he undertakes to write about what he has never studied. We should like to see the face of a "Tutorist" on reading this account of his doctrine. The Tutorists really taught—for the system, in its rigour, has been condemned—that certainty was necessary, not as a warrant for our acts in general, but as a warrant for following the line of conduct *which favours liberty*. Catholics have been accustomed to consider the principle of taking the "safer" side as a distinct principle from that of taking either the probable or the more probable side. It brings in a new rule, that of taking that side which is the safest of the alternatives before us. And we have also been accustomed to consider that the case of the *certainty* of any of a number of alternatives puts an end at once to all probability, greater or smaller, in the others, and not only to all probability,

<sup>1</sup> We may especially mention the work of Mgr. Maynard on *Les Provinciales*, in which each of the *Lettres* is considered separately, its argument analyzed, and its quotations and authorities examined. A more complete exposure of a tissue of falsehoods has never issued from the press.

<sup>2</sup> P. 910.

<sup>3</sup> P. 930.

but to all question as to which of those alternatives is the "safest." Perhaps we are all wrong as to this.

Mr. Gladstone's mistake as to Tutorism seems to me to reappear in other parts of his article, where he slips in the idea of certainty in speaking of questions of probability. He talks as if the less probable opinion was overwhelmed and extinguished by the more probable, as if to follow it was to permit and warrant moral action against probability, as if the doctrine of Probabilism overthrew the whole authority of probable evidence. Everywhere he seems to have the idea of a *certain* obligation, which is evaded by the use of Probabilism. Of course, if a greater amount of probability made an obligation certain, there would be no more discussion on this matter. I can only wonder, considering that he is a man who is not averse to the use of strong language, that he has restrained himself so far as to say no more than he has said about this fancied bugbear. "It would be wrong to assert that it is a doctrine consciously held and taught for purposes adverse to morality or honour." Here Mr. Gladstone absolutely separates himself from Pascal and his Jansenist prompters. "Without venting any such calumny, let us regard it purely in the abstract. . . . For my own part, I know not how, when it is so contemplated, to escape from the impression, that when closely scrutinized it will be found to threaten the very first principles of morals, or to deny that, if universally received and applied, it would go far to destroy whatever there is of substance in moral obligation."

Before I proceed to explain Probabilism, not in any words of my own, but in those of a dear friend, one of the best theologians of his generation, now at rest with God, who more than ten years ago wrote a short paper on the subject in this Review, I may as well refer to a case which Mr. Gladstone puts for the express purpose of showing how very wicked this doctrine of Probabilism is.

An enemy [he says] brings me tidings that an aged parent is in prison and at the point of death, without solace or support. The same person has before deceived and injured me. It is probable that he is doing so again, so probable that, if he communicated any piece of mere intelligence, not involving a question of conduct, it would, on the whole, have appeared most safe not to believe the statement. Let it then even be more likely that he now speaks falsehood than truth. Will that warrant me in remaining where I am, or is it possible to treat with neglect a call which may reveal the want and extremity of a parent,

without an evident, gross, and most culpable want of filial obligation? The answer would be "no," and it would be immediate and universal. And yet the case here put has been one not of greater but of inferior likelihood. How then, we may ask, by the argument *a fortiori*, is it possible to apply to the regulation of our relations towards God a theory which explodes at the first instant when it is tested by perhaps the deepest among all the original instincts of our nature? (p. 932).

It is surely amusing to find Mr. Gladstone giving us an instance in which, as he supposes, the principle of Probabilism could be applied in favour of liberty, a case in which, as he says, it would not be safe to act on the counter principle of Probabiliorism. He does not seem to understand, what is fundamental in all these considerations, that the principle cannot be applied in cases where there are extrinsic reasons, independent of the simple balance of probabilities, for making a certain course of action obligatory. The man who acts at once on the doubtful intelligence that his father is dying, does so because there is some probability that he is, and that his filial duty obliges him to run no risk in the face of such a probability. There is no case, in his mind, of an uncertain obligation. But take away the extrinsic circumstance of such obligation of filial duty, and put in its place a simple command of a parent to do something which is in itself neither right nor wrong. Suppose the "enemy" in question comes to me and tells me that my father has ordered me to pay him five pounds out of some money which he has advanced me. I do not think Mr. Gladstone would be angry with me if I ran the risk of disobeying my father on account of the serious probability that the man was lying. Suppose that the *soi-disant* messenger brought me an injunction which was not to his own benefit, but which simply interfered with my liberty, such as to be at a certain place at a certain time on the following day, or to cut down a favourite tree, or to forego an expedition of innocent enjoyment. I should certainly be justified, even, I think, in Mr. Gladstone's opinion, if I did not obey it as long as there was reasonable tangible solid doubt whether it was true, even though there might be a slight apparent preponderance of probability on the other side. I say justified, by which I mean excusable. I do not say that I should do the most perfect thing: but I should have a right to give myself the benefit of a good reasonable doubt—a principle which, as Mr. Gladstone must be aware, is constantly inculcated on jurymen in English courts of justice.

It will be quite clear to any theologian who may read Mr. Gladstone's article, that, even if he has grasped the principle of Probabilism itself, he has failed to make himself acquainted with the limitations which are universally recognized as applying to its legitimate use. I shall not scruple, as I have already said, to use the words of another writer in these pages rather than my own, in giving a short account of what is really meant by this much abused principle, on which Englishmen, nevertheless, commonly act in ordinary matters of conduct a dozen times a day. It is one of our great misfortunes as Catholics, that no one reads our explanations of our own doctrines. People are quite ready to read accounts of our doctrines and practices given by Dr. Pusey and Dr. Littledale, or Mr. Cartwright, but they won't hear us in our own cause. We can refute the calumnies or misrepresentations which are hurled at our heads, and then a few weeks afterwards they reappear in unblushing vitality. A man like Mr. Gladstone will think himself foolish if he writes on a question of contemporary politics, or of Homeric criticism, without a knowledge of the literature of the subject. But no one seems to think it foolish to write about Catholic doctrines and to repeat charges which have been disposed of a hundred times. The misrepresentations about Probabilism are as great in their way as any of the old legends about Pope Joan or the false Decretals. But they come up again time after time—and what can we do better than repeat again and again their refutations? Why waste the work of brain and the time which it takes to dress up the truth anew, when the people we have to deal with do not take the trouble to put a new face upon the old falsehoods? We may put down for a month or so the charge about Probabilism—it is quite sure to come up again as fresh as ever in the course of a year. So I make no scruple, as the life of an article in a Review such as this cannot be reckoned as very long, to reprint one of the former statements on the subject of Probabilism which have appeared in these pages. It is more than ten years old, and it is one of the few writings which remain to us of one of our most accomplished theologians. It is to be found in the number of this Review for January, 1868, and was occasioned by a very ignorant article on Casuistry which appeared in *Fraser's Magazine*—then, I think, if not still, under the editorship of Mr. Froude.

The writer whom I am about to quote speaks first of the

system of Probabilism as it is found in the Anglican work of Jeremy Taylor, *Ductor Dubitantium*—a work, as he says, mainly taken from Catholic sources, like so many of the productions of the same author. Our first quotation, however, shall be a passage in which he explains the idea of conscience as the proximate rule of human action. I commend this passage to Mr. Gladstone, because he seems to ignore the fact that, in all moral actions, we stand or fall by our conscience, not by the law itself.

The idea of conscience is the central point of moral theology: the whole theory of morality depends upon it. The conscience is the proximate rule of morality, which, when rightly informed and illuminated by faith, puts our moral actions into harmony with the supreme rule of right, which is the eternal law of God. The conscience is an act of the intellect, by which we apply our knowledge to the things which we do, and this may take place in one of three ways:—First, when we recognize that we have done anything or omitted anything, and in this sense the conscience is said to *testify*; secondly, when we judge that anything ought to be done or ought not to be done, and in this sense the conscience is said to *oblige*; thirdly, when by our conscience we judge that what we have done was ill done or well done, and in this sense the conscience is said to *accuse* or *reproach*, or the reverse, as the case may be (St. Thos. 1<sup>a</sup> 2<sup>æ</sup>, q. 79., a. 13. c.).

The conscience may be modified by certain qualities; for example, by certainty, doubt, or opinion. Certainty is the firm adhesion of the intellect to its judgment, without apprehension of the contrary; doubt is the suspension of the intellect between two opposite judgments; opinion is the adhesion of the intellect to one of two opposite judgments, with the fear or apprehension that the other may be true. A doubt is said to be negative when there is little or no reason on either side; as, for example, if we were to ask ourselves whether the number of the fixed stars be odd or even. There is no foundation for either assertion: it is a negative doubt. A doubt is positive when there are serious reasons on both sides, as when there is conflicting evidence in a trial. A speculative doubt is about the existence of an obligation in general; as, for example, in the American war, the question whether the Southerners had a *bellum justum*, a just cause for war, against the Northerners. A practical doubt is of the subjective lawfulness of a particular action; as, for example, if in the same case a citizen had doubted whether in his own particular circumstances he could then and there take up arms in the Southern cause. A doubt of law is of the existence of an obligation; as in the question, Is it lawful to paint on a Sunday? A doubt of fact is of the existence of a fact upon which depends the application of a law; as, for example, Is this day a holiday of obligation? These definitions are necessary for the examination of the nature and lawfulness of

Probabilism in its more elementary form, which is all that we can here attempt.

Then follows an account of the system of Jeremy Taylor, after which the writer proceeds.

We shall now give another explanation of the matter, it being hardly necessary to say that we do not put forward the Anglican doctrine as our own; we claim to be heard and judged by our own statement. The question into which Probabilism chiefly enters is this: where there is a positive speculative doubt as to the existence of an obligation, how does it affect our liberty? All theologians agree that in a *practical* doubt about the lawfulness of any action, we are bound, if we cannot resolve the doubt, to take the safest side. And the reason is clear. In a practical doubt the intellect is suspended between two opposite judgments; one, is the judgment that the act here and now to be done is unlawful; the other, that it is lawful. To act in this doubt is to act against the conscience, which apprehends the danger of sin—according to that “*omne quod non ex fide est peccatum est*” (Rom. xiv. 23). What is not done with a clear consciousness of being right is wrong. Our duty is in such cases to resolve the doubt, or, as it is commonly expressed, “to form our conscience” by the adoption, on prudently chosen grounds, of some practical dictamen which extricates us from practical doubt, though it may not, and perhaps cannot, solve the speculative doubt. For example, if one sees clearly that the doubt is not solidly founded, but is a mere unreasonable apprehension, he may discard it altogether by an act of his will; but if the speculative doubt (which always underlies the practical doubt) be *positive*, then it cannot be prudently discarded. It is in this case chiefly that probabilism comes in.

In considering the motives in favour of either side in speculative doubts, we find that they have many shades or degrees of Probability, which qualify the opinions founded on them. A probable opinion is said to be an opinion which is founded on so weighty a motive, whether intrinsic of reason or extrinsic of authority as to be capable of drawing to itself the assent of a prudent and well-informed man (St. Alph. l. 1, t. 1, c. 3, n. 40). We may conceive it either as an act of the intellect, or as the spoken or written judgment which represents to others the probable opinion of a theologian, and this is the more usual sense. A slightly probable opinion, *opinio tenuiter*, or *dubie probabilis*, is one which, though not destitute of motives, is wanting in that degree of support which is necessary to constitute a probable opinion; a “more probable” opinion, *opinio probabilior*, is one which seems to have a greater degree of probability than the contrary, without necessarily excluding the solid probability of such contrary; a most probable opinion, *opinio probabilissima*, is one which is so probable that the contrary cannot be considered to be sufficiently probable, but at most to



be *tenuiter probabilis*. In all these cases we are to suppose that the respective degrees of Probability have been estimated by competent judges, and after consideration and comparison of the reasons and authorities in favour of the contrary opinions. It is to be noted that when Casuists speak of probable opinions as affecting the certainty of the law, they do not mean the great general laws or precepts in themselves—for about these there is never any doubt in Casuistry—but by a law they signify the extension of such general precept to particular cases, or, in other words, the comprehension of any particular case under the general law ; if this be doubtful the law is said in casuistry to be doubtful. We shall use the word in this sense.

To come back now to our speculative doubt, let us suppose that the opinion in favour of liberty is solidly probable, are we allowed to use it against a more probable opinion in favour of the law, or are we bound to obey the law? All theologians agree that where there is obligation of securing some end, which is independent of the formation of our conscience, we are obliged to act so as to secure that end. This chiefly occurs in doubts of fact. For example, rose water is doubtful matter of Baptism ; and as the priest who administers the sacrament has to secure its validity, he cannot follow the probable opinion except in case of necessity—such necessity as would justify him in risking the validity of the sacrament, as for example, if a child were dying without Baptism and there were nothing but rose water at hand ; and so in innumerable other cases. The question thus becomes limited to that class of doubts which relate to the mere lawfulness or unlawfulness of our own act, considered in itself ; as for example, in questions concerning the obligation of fasting or hearing Mass ; and even in such cases the solution must not be considered separately from collateral circumstances, such as the danger of scandal, offence, and the like, which, if they should occur, would modify the decision. It is necessary to narrow the issue to this point in order to test the validity of Probabilism in its most fundamental principle on which all its applications to other and more complicated cases are founded.

When therefore there is a speculative doubt affecting solely our subjective obedience, we affirm that it can be resolved with the help of a probable opinion in favour of liberty of action against even a more probable opinion in favour of the law. For when there is a solidly probable opinion in favour of liberty, it is clear that the contradictory assertion in favour of the law cannot be certain ; and this is true even if the opinion in favour of the law be the more probable of the two. Because either the reasons and authorities in favour of the law are such as to diminish the solid probability of the contrary opinion in favour of liberty, or they are not. If they be such as to render the opinion in favour of liberty doubtfully or slightly probable, then that is not our hypothesis—the case is changed, and the opinion in favour of liberty is no longer solidly probable, no longer to be relied upon. But if after full examination and consideration by competent judges of all the

reasons and authorities alleged in favour of the law, the opinion in favour of liberty retains its solid probability, it is clear that the contrary reasons cannot produce certainty; and it evidently follows from the probability in favour of liberty, that the law or obligation in question is absolutely doubtful, because by its definition a probable opinion is founded on a motive so weighty as to be sufficient to draw to itself the assent of a prudent and competent judge. How therefore can the contrary be *certain*? And if the law be doubtful, how can it impose a certain obligation?

What would be the difference between a doubtful and a certain obligation if men were equally obliged to obey in both cases? and would it not follow from such a conclusion that the same obligation was at the same time certain and doubtful, which is a contradiction in terms?

When the doctrine of Probabilism is rightly understood it commends itself to our reason. To say that man is bound to obey in all doubts is simply absurd. It is well for a man to obey all certain laws, whether natural, Divine, or human. Happy is he who can say, "All these have I kept from my youth" (St. Matt. xix. 20). It may be indeed a matter of perfection or counsel, to obey in doubtful cases out of reverence for the lawgiver, and to avoid even a material violation of the law. But it is quite unreasonable to oblige all men to do so under pain of sin. St. Thomas Aquinas (in 4 sent. d. 15, a. 6, ad 2m.) declares that "what is prohibited by no law is lawful." And again (De Verit. ix. 11, a. 3), "that no one is bound by a law unless through the knowledge of such law," and he clearly holds that knowledge is incompatible with a contrary probable opinion. From these, and a crowd of other authorities and reasons St. Alphonsus deduces the fundamental principle of his system of Probabilism. "*Lex dubia non potest certam inducere obligationem*" (St. Alph. l. 1, n. 26). *Lex dubia non obligat* (n. 55).

Of course these considerations are suited only to persons capable of judging of the reasons and authorities for and against any obligation of which there is question; and that is chiefly the business of Casuists. As for the simple and ignorant, they must be guided in doubtful cases by others, by their pastor, their confessor, or their superior, or by some prudent friend. St. Thomas Aquinas (2<sup>a</sup> 2<sup>e</sup>, q. 4, a. 8, ad. 2) says, "*aliquis parvæ scientiæ magis certificatur de eo quod audit ab aliquo scientifico quam de eo quod sibi secundum suam rationem videtur*," that is, "one of little knowledge is more certain of that which he hears from a well-informed person than of that which seems to him according to his own reason."

We are now in a position to see how we can lay aside a practical doubt, and within the above-mentioned limits form our conscience by a practical and certain dictamen wherever we have a probable opinion in our favour. Thus: "Where there is a probable opinion in favour of liberty the obligation is doubtful, and therefore does not hold. Now I have a probable opinion in favour of liberty in this case, therefore I am

certainly free to act without sin." This is called "reflex probabilism," and is distinguished from the "direct" probabilism, of which we have a good specimen in Jeremy Taylor, who maintains that in a speculative doubt we can take up and adopt as our own the probable opinion on either side, making it our own judgment by an act of the will. The principle of the reflex probabilism is "*Lex dubia non obligat*," a doubtful law does not oblige. The principle of the direct Probabilists was "*Qui probabiliter agit prudenter agit*:" he who (in doubtful cases) acts in conformity to a probable opinion acts prudently. St. Alphonsus, n. 55, asserts this latter principle to be false, because it is not sufficient for the formation of a certain dictamen of the conscience. With the greatest reverence for the wise and saintly author, we venture to think differently. Surely we can form our conscience to a certain dictamen in this way: "In such and such speculative doubts we are certainly at liberty to follow a probable opinion in favour of liberty; in this particular case I have a probable opinion, therefore I am certainly at liberty to act." Here is a certain practical dictamen. Moreover, the reasons of Jeremy Taylor in favour of direct Probabilism have something in them, and they concur with those of eminent theologians. However, that is merely a question of the schools, and we adhere to the system of St. Alphonsus. Practically it comes to the same thing.

In contrasting the two systems of direct and reflex Probabilism, we certainly recognize two great advantages to sound casuistry which are due to St. Alphonsus. The first is that St. Alphonsus has gone far towards destroying the ground of dispute between Probabilists and Probabiliorists; for if the opinion in favour of liberty be sufficiently well founded to show that the obligation is doubtful (and except it be so it is not truly probable), then the principle, "*Lex dubia non obligat*," evidently has its place, whether the contrary opinion be more or less probable. The second advantage is, that a sound and moderate system of moral theology, equally free from laxity and rigour, has been widely diffused. The wise and moderate system of St. Alphonsus has now become generally accepted. The *quasi* approbation which his writings have received, while it does not oblige us to follow his opinion in all cases, yet warrants us in doing so, so that henceforward there will be much less cause for difference of opinion among Catholic Casuists.

St. Alphonsus seems to have been raised up by God to stem the flood of Jansenistic rigorism with which the Church was threatened at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century, and to set a stamp on many opinions of eminent Casuists whose name and authority had been assailed by the unrelenting enemies of religion. The Jansenists had endeavoured to introduce Calvinism into the Church; in their dogmatic teaching they maintained that some of the commandments of God were impossible, and that Christ had not died for all men. With the true spirit of heresy they violently resisted the authority of the Holy See, and equivocated in their interpretation of the Pontifical decisions. In their moral theology, with great consistency, they assumed

everywhere a subtle and hypocritical severity which rendered the sacraments inaccessible to repentant sinners ; but they were detected and overthrown at all points. Their dogmatic teaching was declared heresy ; and this, and their rigorism in casuistry, were condemned by Alexander the Eighth and other Popes.

It may be well to examine the only solid objection urged against Probabilism—that, it exposes us to the danger of a material violation of the law, and that out of reverence to the Law-giver we should avoid such a danger. We answer, first, that if we sedulously observe all the known and certain laws under which we live, we shall not be wanting in reverence to the Law-giver by considering ourselves to be at liberty where we do not *know* of any obligation to the contrary, being always prepared to obey in all cases where the proper authority may intervene to determine the doubt. Secondly, we have the highest authority for the safety of such a course, as will appear from the following examples : 1. Sinnich and the Jansenist Wendrock (Arnauld's assumed name) denied that it was lawful to follow even the most probable opinion in favour of liberty, and that doctrine was condemned by Alexander the Eighth in prop. 3., 7 Dec. 1690. Hence we have the authority of the Church for following an *opinio probabilissima*, and thus exposing ourselves to the *danger* of materially violating the law. 2. The whole school of Probabiliorists, including the Jesuits Gonzalez and Antoine, the Dominicans Concina and Patuzzi, and a crowd of others, maintain that it is lawful to follow a more probable opinion, and thus expose ourselves to the *probable* danger of a material violation of the law ; and this may be said to be allowed by the whole body of theologians, on the ground that to oblige man to obey the law in all doubtful cases would be to expose him to intolerable perplexity.

Now this consent of the Casuists of all the schools is irresistible authority, in favour of using our liberty in doubtful cases even though we thereby expose ourselves to the *probable* danger of materially violating the law. As to the shade of difference between the probable danger and the more probable danger, it would be infinitely more perplexing to oblige us to determine that. Where there is doubt, a clever theologian may easily make his side appear a little more probable. The only solid foundation of obligation is the certainty of the law. Indeed, as we have shown, there is no room for Probabiliorism in the system of St. Alphonsus. There was obviously a plausible reason for Probabiliorism in those who held with Jeremy Taylor that it was lawful to conform the judgment to a probable opinion *directly*. In such a course there would be a moral discomfort in choosing the less probable in contradiction to a more probable opinion, even though one might think it lawful. But where liberty depends upon the absence of any certain obligation, it is evident that the whole question turns on the certainty or uncertainty of the law. At first sight it may seem to some of our readers that we go further than St. Alphonsus in our doctrine of Probabilism, but we think we have represented his principles exactly. The

key to any difficulties which may be urged from some obscure passages in his works, we think to be this. In the entire course of his works, St. Alphonsus uniformly allows the use of a solidly probable opinion; but it must be remembered that whenever he says of an opinion that it is "*verior*" or "*tutior*" or "*longe probabilior*," he does not allow that the opposite opinion is solidly probable. Those who may wish to see this matter thoroughly discussed, and our view elaborately demonstrated, would do well to read Ballerini "*Dissert. de Moral. System. S. Alfonsi.*" Rome, 1863.

In conclusion, I again protest against Mr. Gladstone's idea that the doctrine of Probabilism in any way saps the authority of probable evidence. It is not easy to understand what is meant by such language. The essence of the theory in question is to affirm that the weight of a true solid probability is so great that it may render the obligation *hic et nunc* of a positive law doubtful in certain cases. This theory might be said to exaggerate the force of genuine probability, or of probable evidence in the abstract. It certainly denies the *decisive* authority of a *balance* of probability in a certain case, and this perhaps is what Mr. Gladstone means. But many things may come in, as he has shown in his instance, to invalidate the force of such a balance in a given case. And if the duty to a parent may override a greater probability so as to induce an obligation in one case, why may not the great magnificent principle of God's government of the world, by which He does not require of men obedience to precepts which are not sufficiently made clear to them, override it so as to suspend an obligation in another? This is the real question, what God requires of man. Those who exaggerate His requirements are no friends, either to His honour or to the welfare of His children. And I venture to ask Mr. Gladstone, whether, considering the whole history of the human race and of the dealings therewith of Him Who is its Eternal Judge, he can really believe that God intends to treat the souls of men as responsible for the violation of His laws, in cases where those laws were not clearly known?

HENRY J. COLERIDGE.

## *Catholic Review.*

---

### I.—NOTES ON THE PRESS.

#### 1.—CARDINAL NEWMAN AND DR. DOLLINGER.

It is the misfortune, but the very natural misfortune of Catholics, that they catch very eagerly at bits of news which refer either to the supposed conversion of distinguished persons to the faith, or to the return to the fold of those who have left it. There are always a number of Catholics who are too ready to spread such reports, which they believe to be true, and which afterwards turn out to be without foundation. There is no malice about them. They express the very natural eagerness which Catholics feel, not for the aggrandizement of the Church or for their own exaltation, but for the welfare of souls—especially, perhaps, those whose miserable lot it has been to fall away from the truth. It has sometimes happened, in our own country, that when some one has been drawing near to Catholicism and alarmed his Protestant friends at the prospect of his “secession,” the report that he has already “seceded” has been inserted in the newspapers, either by oversanguine Catholics, or by Protestants and Anglicans who have desired to prevent the step which it has been asserted that he has taken. These things are accidents which cannot be prevented, and are far more pardonable than the continual parading of lists of converts of which, unfortunately, we have too many instances.

Every one knows the sorrow which all true Catholics have felt at the position now occupied by Dr. Dollinger. He is a very distinguished and a very learned man, whose writings have done great service to the Church. The line which he adopted about the time of the Vatican Council—and, indeed, before that time—was a line which could have but one issue—the issue of rebellion against the Church. He has remained in that position ever since. We need not specify the details of his case. It is enough to say that, without having joined actually in the organization of the schismatical body which calls itself “*Alt-Katholik*,” he has remained and remains in a position of isolation and rebellion. The developments of the body of which we speak have been exactly what might have been predicted. It has leant entirely on the State for support, without which support it could not live, and it has abandoned one Catholic doctrine and practice and rule after another. It is fast assuming a character which must deprive it of the sympathy of respectable High Churchmen in England of the school of Dr. Pusey, much as they naturally rejoice over any schism which may seem to



countenance their own. It has been stated in various quarters of late that Dr. Döllinger was more and more disgusted with the masquerade on religion which he had himself done so much to call into existence. It was natural for sanguine minds to build upon the hope that this learned old man might come to make his peace with the Church, and it was said that Leo the Thirteenth had sent him a kind message. Thus it seems to have come about that a false telegram announcing Dr. Döllinger's submission to the Church was inserted in an Italian paper, from which it was, of course, copied into a large part of the press of Europe.

Dr. Döllinger seems to have been extremely irritated at the report, and it elicited from him a contradiction, if not more than one contradiction, couched in very savage language indeed. All Catholics will regret that the report was ever circulated, since it has led this unfortunate old man to pledge himself deeper than ever to live and die in rebellion against the Church. But their regret will be turned into something like indignation when they hear that Dr. Döllinger is reported to have been led on to speak, in a manner which we should be sorry to have to characterize as it deserves, of the elevation of Dr. Newman to the Cardinalate. There is, indeed, a singular contrast in the career of these two men, and it is possible that some consciousness of the rebuke to himself which that contrast conveys may have sharpened the tongue of Dr. Döllinger. Years ago, who would have thought that the great Catholic historian of the Church in Germany, the man to whom she seemed to look for still greater services than any he had yet rendered, the man who seemed marked out for her highest confidence and her most exalted rewards, would at the end of his days contradict the whole of his life and the first principles of his own teaching, by an act of schismatical rebellion exactly parallel to that of a hundred heretics whose fall he had chronicled and mourned over! Who would have thought, at the same time, that the vigorous champion of Anglicanism in the University of Oxford, an Englishman of Englishmen, the fearless and simple-minded adopter of the theological and ecclesiastical position of a whole line of divines who had built up, on paper at least, the most respectable and plausible system that ever opposed itself to the Church of Christ, the man who might have been intoxicated, if any one might, by the loyal support and confidence which he received from the most earnest and noble minds of his time and country, would have thrown up his great position of leadership, and become a humble servant of the Church which he had once fought against, and at last, in the same stage of life at which Dr. Döllinger fell, be called by the Supreme Pontiff, amid the applause and rejoicing of the whole world, to the highest honours on earth which the Church has to bestow! Wonderful indeed alike are the ways of Providence and the issues of the human heart. The Catholic has become the rebel and the apostate, the slave of the State, the patron of a schism which he will not himself join. The champion of a State schismatical Church has become the glory of the

Sacred College, after having for years won himself a position in the hearts of his countrymen, and of Catholics and Protestants everywhere, which no one else in our time has filled. We are not going to draw out the moral of this wonderful contrast between the beginnings and the endings of two men so distinguished for ability, for learning, for historical philosophy, and for services to the Church. We leave it to the minds and hearts of Christians everywhere, who will perhaps see in it a fresh illustration of the old old words of the Blessed Mother of God—

Fecit potentiam in brachio suo,  
Dispersit superbos mente corde sui,  
Deposuit potentes de sede,  
Et exaltavit humiles.

Sad indeed as it is to think of the present position of Dr. Döllinger, it is almost sadder to find him lashing out in ill-humoured vituperation of the man whose course in the Church has been so strange a contrast to his own. Cardinal Newman, by the confession of all the world, is distinguished for few things more than for his courtesy and gentleness in speaking of those from whom he disagrees. In an age of free and unbridled language—not always confined, as it ought to be confined, to the avowed enemies of the Catholic Church—Cardinal Newman has sometimes had to speak strongly, but he has always spoken as kindly and generously of his opponents as he has spoken modestly and frankly of himself. No set of men have more reason to feel this than Dr. Döllinger and his friends. If it were only a matter of taste, the language which Dr. Döllinger has lately indulged in—if he be truly reported—as to Cardinal Newman and his writings, is most deplorable and most disgraceful. We still hope that he will either disavow it or retract it. But, putting aside the question of taste, decency, and courtesy, we take the liberty of saying that the statement which is now attributed to Dr. Döllinger is little short of a calumny, both against the Holy See and against Cardinal Newman. It is certainly untrue, in a measure which ought to bring its untruth within the cognizance of any well-informed person, that the Holy See could possibly raise to the Cardinalate any one to whose writings the charge made by Dr. Döllinger could truly be applied. It is notoriously untrue that works written in English are not watched and noticed by Roman authorities, especially works which proceed from writers of so much fame and influence as Cardinal Newman. Works of much comparative insignificance, which might be expected to do but little harm, on account of the want of influence of their writers or the poorness of their argument, are yet from time to time visited by the censures of the Church. It is as absurd as it is insolent to insinuate that the elevation of our great English Oratorian to the Roman purple means anything less than it would mean if his writings had been produced in any language in Europe, or if he had laboured for the service of the Church in Italy or France or Germany instead of in England.

2.—THE BIBLE AND ASSYRIOLOGY. BY REV. M. F. VIGOUROUX.

From the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for April, 1879.

THAT the Assyrian and Babylonian discoveries have rendered great service in the exact determination of many biblical statements is generally acknowledged, and it is precisely for this reason that public attention has been in our time more strongly attracted to Assyrian than to Egyptian antiquities. It had been supposed that Egypt could supply the most valuable information respecting the early history of the People of God, but the Egyptian inscriptions having possible reference to events mentioned in Holy Writ, are as yet very scanty, and even for the most part doubtful. Better success has attended the excavations on the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris. As soon as it had become possible to explain with some confidence the arrow-headed characters of Persepolis and Besutun, and when the key to the Assyrian inscriptions had been found, people watched with great interest the progress of the discoveries, and scholars lost no time in making known the most important results of their studies in popular treatises and in articles communicated to various periodicals. More than thirty years ago the first attempts were made to decipher the Assyrian inscriptions, of which the Persian translations in cuneiform characters had been already satisfactorily explained. But the great number of the signs employed, the curious composition of the proper names, the frequent use of so-called monograms and ideograms, offered difficulties which deterred many from the study, and threw great doubt upon the results attained. When, in the year 1857, these results were put to the trial by a comparison of the different translations of Tiglath-pileser's cylinder, presented by the four most celebrated Assyrian scholars of that time, the correctness of the principles upon which the interpretation proceeded was proved beyond doubt. This was the first step towards an exact explanation of the monumental records of Assyria. Since that time these new studies have been cultivated in England, amongst others principally by Sir Henry Rawlinson, Fox Talbot, Sayce, George Smith; in France, by Jules Oppert, Joachim Ménant, and François Lenormant; and in Germany, by Eberhard Schrader and Friedrich Delitzsch; and translations of almost all Assyrian historical inscriptions have been attempted either in part or wholly by these eminent scholars. Good hopes were entertained that great light would be thrown on some difficult points in the biblical records, and for that reason the little details of exact philology received less careful attention. Because the main facts of the annals of the Assyrian Empire amply satisfied the general demand for information, therefore relatively little progress has been made of late in Assyrian studies, and many early translations still need correction. No one who has not followed all publications on cuneiform

inscriptions would be aware that Uruk, Ourcham, Likbagas, &c., represent the name of the same king written in the same characters, or that Hea and Nisroch stand similarly for the same god, or that the same character which was formerly translated "goats" is now translated "wine," and so on. The Rev. M. F. Vigouroux acknowledges this fact in a note, where he says: "Nous devons prévenir le lecteur qu'aucune traduction assyrienne n'est encore parfaitement sûre dans tous ses détails, mais nous connaissons sûrement la substance et le fonds des documents originaux."<sup>1</sup> This want of exactness where it was quite attainable has been shown more clearly by the Rev. P. Delattre, S.J., in an article: "Les inscriptions historiques de Ninive," in the *Revue Catholique*, 1878. In this respect the words of the eminent Assyrian scholar, François Lenormant, may be applied to almost all Assyrian translations, when he says: "Il y a sous ce rapport tout un travail d'élimination à faire d'après une étude mieux comprise des syllabaires, travail qui aura pour résultat de supprimer beaucoup de données inexactes admises jusqu'à ce jour."<sup>2</sup> The necessity of rectifying some philological details does not forbid the use of any safe results for making a comparison with the biblical account, but it sometimes renders subsequent conclusions doubtful or even impossible. Therefore it is quite necessary for every one who wishes to form an accurate and independent judgment on the Assyrian inscriptions and their translations, to go through the various syllabaries and the so-called bilingual texts, and to examine often with great patience the original clay tablets, in order to form his own opinion. It is not very difficult to find out from an inscription the proper names, the genealogies in the beginning of the inscriptions, the numbers, the date at the end of the contract tablets, and so on; but to give an exact translation of a whole non-historical inscription is even now often exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, and there is no hope of further progress until all accessible texts are critically collated, and the results put together in a well-arranged dictionary. Till now no such attempt has been made, and therefore a great deal of work has yet to be done before Assyrian studies have attained any kind of completeness.

The most attractive part of Assyriology is undoubtedly the comparison of the accounts given in the Assyrian annals of historical events noticed in the Bible, and these portions of Assyrian history are also the most largely developed. In former times the Bible was almost the only source of knowledge in the early history of Assyria and Babylonia, but now the incidental remarks of the Bible supply far less information than the remains of the royal archives found at Niniveh. The historical results of these discoveries have been published at different times in various languages, as in English, by George Smith: *History of Assyria; History of Babylonia*; in French, by Oppert: *Histoire des Empires de Chaldée et d'Assyrie*; by Ménant: *Annales des Rois d'Assyrie; Babylone et la Chaldée*; by Lenormant: *Manuel d'histoire ancienne*; in German,

<sup>1</sup> P. 343.<sup>2</sup> *Les syllabaires cunéiformes*, édition critique, p. 6.

by Eberhard Schrader: *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament; Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*; in Italian, by Finzi: *Ricerche per lo studio dell' Antichità Assira*; in Danish, by Valdemar Schmidt: *Syriens Oldtid belyst ved ikke-bibelske kilder*, &c. The Society of Biblical Archæology has announced the intention of promoting the knowledge of Assyrian antiquities, and publishes in the *Transactions* all new translations and corrections and the results attained in recent discoveries. The periodical, *Mélanges d'archéologie Assyrienne et Egyptienne*, keeps its readers informed of the scientific results of Assyrian studies. But as in so large a number of books and periodicals, which often devote considerable space to religious and literary controversies, it is occasionally difficult to ascertain the latest condition of some particular historical question, a summary recapitulation of the results of these studies under a new aspect is always welcome even to scholars, and the Rev. M. F. Vigouroux certainly deserves the thanks of many readers for the use which he has made of all accessible publications in illustrating from recently discovered Assyrian sources the biblical account of the Assyrian invasions of the kingdom of Israel. He goes carefully through the Assyrian annals, and points out all historical incidents mentioned in the Bible and illustrated by the cuneiform inscriptions, from the beginning of the Assyrian monarchy to the reign of Sargon.

The first Assyrian monarch whose name occurs in the inscriptions is Ismedagan, called "Pates'i," or Viceroy of Assyria,<sup>3</sup> about the nineteenth century B.C. The names of his ancestors and his successors are mentioned only incidentally in later inscriptions, so that the early history of Assyria is but little known. The most ancient Assyrian inscription of any length and of historical value is the inscription on the cylinder of Tiglathpileser the First from the twelfth century B.C. This monarch ruled over the country from Phœnicia as far as Nairi, a province of Armenia. Under his successors the military glory of Assyria seems to have been eclipsed till the ninth century B.C., when Assurnazir-pal, the son of Tuklat-Adar (or Tuklat Samdan, or Tiglath-ninip) came to the throne. Of this monarch we still possess very extensive inscriptions, relating his various campaigns, found by Mr. Layard in the north-west palace of Nimrud. His dominion extended from the Mediterranean Sea and from Lebanon to the Tigris. His son and successor, Shalmaneser the Second (about 859—825 B.C.) undertook several campaigns against Syria and Palestine. The so-called Black Obelisk, found at Nimrud by Sir Austen Layard, and now in the British Museum, and the Kurkh inscription discovered by Jones Taylor, give a full account of the military operations of this powerful Assyrian King. These two monuments attracted from the first the attention of Assyriologists, because the names of Achab, King of Israel, Benhadad (Bin-hid-ri) King of Damascus, Hazael, Iehu, &c., were easily identified with the biblical names. We have now a full historical account of these times instead of mere incidental mention in the Bible, and in every

<sup>3</sup> Inscription of Tiglathpileser the First in I. R. 16, col. viii. l. 2.

case the accuracy of the Scriptural narrative is confirmed and illustrated; the recent discoveries by Mr. H. Rassám in the excavations at the mound Baláwát will probably complete the whole history of this monarch. The bas-reliefs on the bronze gates from Baláwát, which will be published this year in photographs, show us, moreover, many details of the military life of the Assyrians at that time, vividly represented, and they form an excellent commentary on many passages of the inspired Prophets concerning the enemies of the chosen people of God. Indeed, nobody could now venture to assert, as many pagan philosophers in the beginning of Christendom and even many Rationalists in the last century actually asserted, that all the historical occurrences related in the Sacred Volume are mere fables and myths.

One difficult point, however, as it seems, still remains. We know accurately from the historical inscriptions and the Eponym lists the order of succession of the Assyrian kings from about B.C. 893 to 647, and yet all attempts have failed to discover the King Phul, of whom is stated: "And Phul, King of the Assyrians, came into the land, and Menahem gave Phul a thousand talents of silver, to aid him and to establish him in the kingdom."<sup>4</sup> This apparent disagreement of the Assyrian history and the Bible raised many theories and caused various chronological systems. Rev. M. F. Vigouroux reviews them all, and follows at last Dr. Schrader's opinion, that Phul of the Bible and Tiglathpileser the Second (about B.C. 745—727) of the cuneiform inscriptions, are the same king. This opinion may be confirmed even by the Bible itself, because in 1 Paral. v. 26 they seem to be spoken of as one person: "And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Phul, King of the Assyrians, and the spirit of Telgathphalnasar, King of Assur: and *he* carried away Ruben," &c. Of the successor of Tiglathpileser, Shalmaneser the Fourth, very few inscriptions are known. He reigned five years, from about B.C. 727—722, and was followed by King Sargon, the famous builder of Dur-Sarkayan, the modern Khorsábád, N.E. of Mossul. This monarch relates in his annals, and in the inscriptions of his palace: "I besieged and occupied the town of Samaria, and took 27,290 of its inhabitants captive."<sup>5</sup>

This fact seems to be attributed in the Bible to King Shalmaneser (4 Kings xviii. 9, "Salmanasar King of the Assyrians came up to Samaria, and besieged it, and took it"), but a close inspection of the original text of this passage shows that the exact translation of this text must be, "Salmanasar King of the Assyrians came up to Samaria, and besieged it, and *they* took it," so that Sargon may have acted as a general delegated by the King. This explanation, proposed by M. Oppert, is followed with a little modification by M. F. Vigouroux, and at once brings the Bible into agreement with the annals of the Assyrian monarch. These splendid inscriptions of Sargon, the ornament

<sup>4</sup> 4 Kings xv. 19.

<sup>5</sup> *Fastes de Sargon*, lin. 23, "ir S'a-me-ri-na al-ve ak-sud, 27,290 nisi a-sib libbi-su as-lu-la."



of his palace at Khorsábád, shed quite a new light on the history of the Assyrian Empire at the end of the eighth century B.C. The labours of M. Oppert and the French school of Assyriologists were principally directed to the elucidation of these inscriptions of the Sargonides, which fill almost two volumes in folio in the admirable edition of Botta's *Monuments de Ninive*.

The biblical facts and names mentioned in the Assyrian archives naturally attract the keenest interest, and possess the first importance. They have even received attention from many who do not care for antiquities at all on their own account. The gain to be derived from the cuneiform inscriptions is not limited to proper names, the dry account of the campaigns of the Assyrian monarchs, with numbers and dates, but from the language itself it is easy to gather many valuable suggestions, and much corroboration of Holy Writ. Whoever reads the Assyrian inscriptions in their original language, and compares the corresponding or analogous passages in the Bible, will find a striking similarity even in the verbal expressions. Thus<sup>6</sup> the Assyrian Rabsaces speaks to the messengers of Ezechias: "Thus saith the great King, the King of the Assyrians: What is this confidence, wherein thou trustest?" These words reproduce similar expressions in Assyrian, as, "Darius the King speaks thus,"<sup>7</sup> or, "He says thus,"<sup>8</sup> as a very common phrase to introduce another person speaking. The title of the King is the ordinary Assyrian title, as, "Sennacherib the great King, the powerful King, the King of nations, the King of Assyria."<sup>9</sup> The words, "What is this confidence?" recall the frequent phrase in the inscriptions, "The gods to whom I trust."<sup>10</sup> Similar analogies may be shown in almost all passages of the Bible relating to the Assyrians and Babylonians. The history of Babylonia and Assyria, as given in the original monuments, affords a new insight into the meaning of many allusions in the Bible, and many difficulties of biblical archaeology are cleared up thereby. Some of these confirmatory texts are collected by Dr. Eb. Schrader in *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, but a great deal more may be obtained from the new inscriptions, and from the splendid sculptures and other antiquities which are hidden in the different museums of Europe, or brought to notice only in large and expensive volumes, quite beyond the reach of most readers, and even of many scholars. The so-called bilingual inscriptions in Accadian and Assyrian, which have reference principally to mythological subjects, furnish many details which help to establish the exactness of the biblical estimate of the religious ideas of these imperial races, which at different

<sup>6</sup> 4 Kings xviii. 19.

<sup>7</sup> Behistun Inscription, l. 1, "Da-ri-ya-vus sarru ki-a-av i-gab-bi."

<sup>8</sup> Cylinder A of Assurbanipal in III. R. 21, col. v. l. 87, "Ki-a-av ik-bi . . . um-ma."

<sup>9</sup> Inscription of Sennacherib in I. R. 37, l. 1, "Sin-akhe-irba sarru rabu, sarru dan-nu, sar kis-sa-ti, sar mat Assur."

<sup>10</sup> v.g. Inscription of Assurnazirpal in I. R. 18. l. 104, "Ilani tig-li-ya."

times seduced the chosen people of God from their allegiance, and may perhaps have received from their captives some rays of the light of the one true religion. However, before it will be possible to use the knowledge obtained from a study of the antiquities of Mesopotamia in forming further conclusions, and in elucidating the text of the Bible, it is absolutely requisite that a critical revision should be made of the translations hitherto effected, and in all further publications of the kind care will have to be taken to secure all possible accuracy.

---

## II.—REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

1. *William Cobbett.* A Biography. By Edward Smith. London: Sampson Low and Co., 1878.

COBBETT was in all respects but one an impersonation of John Bull. His virtues and his faults alike were of the English type. He hated hypocrites and tyrants, he loved fair-play, he defended the weak, he called a spade a spade, whatever might be the consequences, he was made more unconquerable by defeat, he had a very high opinion of himself, he was domestic in his habits, and irreproachable in his moral conduct, a faithful husband, a careful father, dear to his friends, and formidable to his enemies. He could shake hands with the fiercest assailant when the war was ended, if the fighting had been fair, or the excesses committed could be ascribed to the fury of battle, but for deeper malice he retained implacable resentment. With all this strength of character and British obstinacy, he was as impulsive as a Frenchman. He could change his plans on the instant with the suddenness of an inspiration, and then adhere to the amendment with dogged pertinacity.

Mr. Smith has given us an excellent picture of that curious career, with the almost unbroken peacefulness of its home circle and the incessant raging of the storm outside; and he has endeavoured to make his hero tell the tale in his own words as far as possible. The honest pride which made Cobbett willing to refer on all occasions to his own experiences has furnished his biographer with ample materials, which have been put together with considerable discrimination, though by the hand of an admirer. Each chapter bears for its title a descriptive sentence quoted from the voluminous writings of the great political reformer.

William Cobbett was born in 1762, and died in 1835. He was one of the "people" whose cause he so valiantly defended. His father was the possessor of a small farm, his grandfather was a day-labourer. He spoke with reverence of this honest grandfather, but traced his pedigree no further back, "for this plain reason," that he had never heard the name mentioned of any more distant ancestor. The family lived near Farnham in Surrey, and the early training of the boy had its influence on all his after life. It was in hard working in the fields, and rough

sports to match, that he laid the foundation of that vigorous health which never failed him, except in one short illness, till the close of life.

I do not remember the time when I did not earn my living. My first occupation was driving the small birds from the turnip-seed, and the rooks from the peas. When I first trudged a-field, with my wooden bottle and my satchel swung over my shoulders, I was hardly able to climb the gates and stiles, and, at the close of the day, to reach home was a task of infinite difficulty.

Among the items of rough play in childhood was the exploit of being rolled down a sand-hill. What he says about the sand-hill is so characteristic of the man and the writer, that it must be quoted—

I am perfectly satisfied that if I had not received such an education, or something very much like it; that if I had been brought up a milksop, with a nursery maid everlastingly at my heels, I should have been at this day as great a fool, as inefficient a mortal, as any one of those frivolous idiots that are turned out from Winchester or Westminster School, or from any of those dens of dunces called colleges and universities. It is impossible to say how much I owe to that sand-hill; and I went to return it my thanks for the ability which it probably gave me to be one of the greatest terrors, to one of the greatest and most powerful bodies of knaves and fools, that ever were permitted to afflict this or any other country (vol. i. p. 9).

The visit here referred to was made on his return from America in 1800, and gave occasion to one of his happiest descriptions—

There is a hill, not far from the town, called Crooksbury Hill, which rises up out of the flat, in the form of a cone, and is planted with Scotch fir-trees. Here I used to take the eggs and young ones of crows and magpies. This hill was a famous object in the neighbourhood. It served as the superlative degree of height. "As high as Crooksbury Hill" meant, with us, the utmost degree of height. Therefore, the first object that my eyes sought was this hill. I could not believe my eyes! Literally speaking, I, for a moment, thought the famous hill removed, and a little heap put in its stead; for I had seen in New Brunswick a single rock, or hill of solid rock, ten times as big, and four or five times as high! The post-boy going downhill, and not a bad road, whisked me in a few minutes to the Bush Inn, from the garden of which I could see the prodigious *sand-hill* where I had begun my gardening works. What a *nothing*! But now came rushing into my mind all at once, my pretty little garden, my little blue smock-frock, my little nailed shoes, my pretty pigeons that I used to feed out of my hands, the last kind words and tears of my gentle and tender-hearted and affectionate mother. I hastened back into the room. If I had looked a moment longer, I should have dropped.

When he was eleven years old, he was employed in the garden of the Castle of Farnham, and was so ravished by a description of Kew Gardens, that he set off at once to see them with 6½d. in his pocket. With half of this sum he bought some food, and the other half he invested in Swift's *Tale of a Tub*. Next day he procured work in Kew Gardens, where the Prince of Wales did him the honour of laughing at his blue smock-frock and red garters.

Ten years later he had lost nothing of this impulsiveness and improvidence. He had started to go to Guildford Fair, but his way took him across the turnpike-road. The London coach was rattling down the hill towards him, and to London he went, without knowing

why. Once there, rather than go back with the story of his foolish whim, he endured eight or nine months in a lawyer's office; and when he could endure the drudgery no longer, he offered himself to a recruiting sergeant. After a year at Chatham, he was sent to New Brunswick. His good conduct won for him very rapid promotion, and he became sergeant-major and *factotum* to the regiment. He had a large insight into the systematic peculation and detestable cruelty which disgraced the service, and he spoke so indignantly sometimes to those over him, that he would have been flogged more than once for disrespect, if he had not been a pattern of sobriety and industry and soldierly bearing, and if he had not, moreover, made himself too useful to be set aside. Amid very heavy regimental duties, he found time for earnest study of grammar, logic, rhetoric, geometry, and fortifications. At the end of eight years he applied for his discharge, in order to do his best to bring to justice some of those who robbed the poor soldier of his pay, and flogged him if he asked for what belonged to him. No one now denies the iniquity of the practices against which Cobbett raised his voice; the only difficulty is to believe that they could have been tolerated at any time. The common soldiers never had enough to eat. Strong, growing country lads would lie awake at night "crying with hunger," because the officials, through whom the public money came to them, kept a large portion of it in their own pockets by no better right than the law of the stronger. The punishments in use were so dreadful, and were inflicted for so slight a provocation, that the men did not dare to complain. The abuse was well known, and yet Government had not the courage to wrest from the oppressors of the poor their villainous perquisites, and could devise no better means of removing the grievance than to apply a further portion of the public money to the maintenance of the army, so as to enable the thieves in office to pay the soldiers what they were by law bound to pay them, without having to forego their own illegal profits.

The court-martial in which Cobbett was to make good his accusations was never held, because at the last moment the accuser did not appear. Much use was made of this to bring discredit upon Cobbett, and a mendacious account of the affair was published many years afterwards to damage his reputation. The truth is, that he could not prove his point without bringing upon a friend and accomplice a military flogging.

In the same year (1792), the first of his wedded life, he went to France, and after living for some months at a village near St. Omer, was actually on his way to Paris to spend the winter there, when he heard of the assault upon the Tuileries, and prudently withdrew to Philadelphia. There for two years he taught English to the French *émigrés*, and eked out his earnings by translating books. It has often been asserted that Talleyrand became his pupil, but it is only true that he desired to do so. Cobbett was convinced that Talleyrand was a French spy, and treated him conformably with that false hypothesis, rudely rejecting his polite

and generous offers. Some good anecdotes belong to this period. The impression produced by the first sight of Protestant pews upon an unsophisticated stranger, who had grown up in ignorance of that curious contrivance for entering Heaven by violence, is thus described by the then future historian of the Reformation.

A Frenchman, who had been driven from St. Domingo to Philadelphia by the Wilberforces of France, went to church along with me on Sunday. He had never been in a Protestant place of worship before. Upon looking round him, and seeing everybody *comfortably seated*, while a couple of good stoves were keeping the place as warm as a slack oven, he exclaimed, "*Pardi! on se sert Dieu bien à son aise ici?*"

Cobbett might have gone on teaching English if, in the course of a warm debate with one of his pupils, he had not pledged himself in his anger to defend his country in a pamphlet against the virulent abuse which Dr. Priestley's arrival in America had evoked. When once the stone had been set rolling it never stopped. The first pamphlet was more famous than remunerative. The net profit to the author was 1s. 7½d. But it found its way into many hands, and was reprinted in England. The Democrats, who were very strong in Philadelphia, were bitterly hostile to the Federal party, with Washington at its head, and they never spoke of England or King George without some epithet of hatred and contempt. Cobbett drew his sword, and threw away the scabbard. Pamphlet followed pamphlet *A Bone to gnaw for the Democrats*, *A Kick for a Bite*, *A Little Plain English*, and others. The nickname *Porcupine* was flung at him in some newspaper, and he caught it and kept it. *Peter Porcupine* was for many years a famous name in the Old as well as in the New World.

A quarrel with his publisher made him start publishing on his own account, and he would have no half measures. He hung up in his shop window all the portraits of royal personages that he could find, and a staring print of "Lord Howe's Decisive Victory over the French Fleet." A threatening crowd collected in the street, but they admired his audaciousness too much to smash his windows on that occasion. However, he received many threatening letters, and if "pocket shooters" had existed, he would have been in real danger. The wordy war raged fiercely. At first Cobbett answered his opponents by a monthly issue of the *Political Censor*, but he soon found the irksomeness of such delay. "A falsehood," he sagely says, "that remains uncontradicted for a month begins to be looked upon as a truth, and when the detection at last makes its appearance, it is often as useless as that of the doctor who finds his patient expired."<sup>1</sup>

Cobbett's determined vindication of England naturally suggested the suspicion of his being in receipt of Government pay. His indignant refutation of the slander is one of his masterpieces. The arguments are unanswerable, and the tone, in marked contrast to his usual violence, is that of a man who can afford to speak calmly, because he is defending

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 187.

a good cause. "It is hard to prove a negative," he says; "it is what no man is expected to do; yet I think I can prove that the accusation of my being in British pay is not supported by one single fact, or the least shadow of probability."<sup>2</sup>

He was tried for libel in Philadelphia, before a judge and jury of the opposite party, and the verdict was against him with heavy damages and costs. The damages (£1,000) were paid by a subscription of Englishmen in Canada, but the expenses of the trial (£600) he had to defray. This did not ruin him, but it made him sigh to be back in his native country. In 1800 he returned to England. His zealous defence of the Government had attracted much attention, and the way to fortune by Court favour would have been a very easy one. He must not be judged by the mistakes of his life. There is a grandeur as true as it is rare in the patriotism of a man who with wealth and honour and easy life to reward him if he were willing to continue at the bidding of others the very work which he had been doing before in obedience to his own convictions, deliberately chose hard labour with uncertain recompense. Sometimes his thoughts were wise, and sometimes they were not; but he showed by his voluntary self-sacrifice that they were sincere.

In January, 1802, he commenced his justly celebrated Political Register, which he carried on to his death, in June, 1835. At first he praised Pitt, and for a longer time he approved of Windham; but his "contentious spirit" soon fell to abusing everybody and everything—the bad for their wickedness, and the good for allowing others to be bad. It is too true that his complaints were not without cause. "It was now (1805) open war. Mr. Cobbett, for the second time in his life, found himself *standing alone*."<sup>3</sup>

In 1809, flogging in the army began to be much spoken of, stoutly defended by ministerial newspapers, and reprobated with a loud outcry by the Liberal papers. The suppression of a local militia mutiny by the German Legion was the signal for war. Cobbett had often seen the operation of flogging, and had felt it as a possible contingency in his own case. He speaks with all his bitterness about those who advocate that method of inspiring patriot ardour—

*Five hundred lashes each! Aye, that is right! Flog them! flog them! flog them! They deserve a flogging at every meal-time. Lash them daily! lash them duly! What! shall the rascals dare to mutiny? And that, too, when the German Legion is so near at hand? . . .* (Vol. ii. p. 94.)

It was no mere libel this time, but full-blown sedition. No Government could, or should, permit even acknowledged abuses to be assailed in newspaper articles directly inciting large masses of men to take revenge into their own hands. Cobbett was going the way of most reformers; and, if he had not been treated roughly, his remedy would have been worse for the country than the hideous disease against which he prepared it. His own words may be turned against himself. They

<sup>2</sup> Vol. i. p. 168.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. i. p. 328.



are almost as true of agitators as of tyrants. "The folly, common to all tyrants, is that they push things too far."

Cobbett was very soon in Newgate. It took the jury only a few minutes to decide that the writing was seditious, and likely to bring about disunion in the army. He had two years in prison, but imprisonment for genuine, even though indiscreet, philanthropy carries no dishonour with it; the long residence in Newgate was made almost pleasant by the devotion of many faithful friends. He had a greater reward in knowing that at much cost to himself he had brought about the immediate abolition of flogging in the American army, and had at least completed all essential preparations for its final extinction in England. His days of captivity were not passed in idleness. He was taking notes, and making plans, and writing treatises. And when at last he came forth from prison, it was like Britannia or her native oak, with increased majesty and dreadfulness by reason of the storm.

He soon made the country too hot for him, and the "Gagging Bills," as they were called, made it clear in the beginning of the year 1817, that he would have to choose between silence, imprisonment, or expatriation; so back he went to America, where if there was much Democratic violence, there was no impediment to free writing about abuses in England. He fully meant to return as soon as he could do so with safety. This he declared in his farewell address. "If I have life for only a year or two at farthest, I shall be back with them (his readers) again."

When he returned to England in 1819, he was guilty of the extravagant folly of bringing Tom Paine's bones with him. The truth is, that Cobbett does not improve with advancing years. He grows more bitter, more irreverent, more self-asserting; but to the end he is honest and true-hearted. Of the thousands of pages of violent invective, which he thought were written for immortality, no one would care now to read more lines than might serve for a specimen of a happily extinct mode of argument, but William Cobbett has left his stamp upon his age and country. He rooted out many noxious weeds, but he also tore up some good wheat. He left behind him less corruption in high places, and more unwillingness to work in that portion of the people which he considered it an insult to term the "lower order." He quarrelled with the parsons, and saw through the utter baseness of the first Protestants in England, but he had not the humility which opens the mind to higher influences of grace, and his *History of the Reformation*, which has helped other souls to the light of truth, brought its author not one step nearer to the Church of Jesus Christ.

2. *One Generation of a Norfolk House, a contribution to Elizabethan History.* By Augustus Jessopp, D.D., Head Master of King Edward the Sixth's School, Norwich. Second Edition. London : Burns and Oates, 1879.

We have much satisfaction in bidding welcome to this new edition of Dr. Jessopp's most interesting book. On the first appearance of this history of the Jesuit Walpoles, several months ago, we introduced it to our readers in an article,<sup>1</sup> in which we discussed with much freedom some of the points suggested by Dr. Jessopp's handling of the subject. At that time, while we made no secret of our opinion that on certain points of importance there was much to be said against the view taken by Dr. Jessopp, it was a pleasure to us to say that the author's desire to be fair and just is very evident, and that he has succeeded to an extent which is very rare, or more truly we might say, which may be looked for elsewhere in vain, amongst writers who are not Catholics. We then expressed our sincere regret that so valuable a book should have been published by subscription, and that it thus should be within the reach of very few, and we trusted that the time was not far distant when a new edition would appear. From the circular we have received from the publishers we have the satisfaction of learning that the expression of our wish has been the cause of its own speedy accomplishment, and that Dr. Jessopp's book is now republished. The original was an *édition de luxe*, a quarto on which it was plain that trouble and expense had not been spared, and Messrs. Burns and Oates have reproduced it in octavo, with a care and an excellence of workmanship worthy of the original edition.

Dr. Jessopp's work deserves to be praised for two different qualities, which rarely meet. It is the result of an amount of laborious and conscientious research that is very admirable. Any one who consults the copious notes will see how little they have been drawn from the ordinary sources of information. They betray an amount of labour that could only have been bestowed on a work in which personal interest and love for the subject prevailed throughout. No future historian of the reign of Elizabeth can afford to neglect this book, as so much of the heavy work of collecting authentic materials is here done to his hand. The "List of some of the rarer books referred to," with the very useful comments upon them, is so good that it should be made to serve as the nucleus for a complete bibliographical catalogue and description of the Catholic books published during the times of persecution.

To the power of steady persevering research Dr. Jessopp adds a force and vividness of expression that betray how completely he has transferred himself to the times of which he writes. It is this, and not a dry antiquarianism, that has given an interest to every detail. The reader is consequently carried away by the writer's energy, and many will find themselves interested in matters that they never cared for before. It will be a misfortune if the book does not find many Protestant

<sup>1</sup> *Month and Catholic Review*, November, 1878.

readers. It is sufficient of itself to overthrow "the Protestant tradition" in a fair mind. Well meaning men have no idea how the Catholic religion was all but extirpated from English soil. One Catholic of our acquaintance has an old volume of prints which graphically show what the rack was like, and how priests and laymen were hanged, drawn and quartered for their faith. Another has a collection of the Penal Laws with the penalties given in black letter; and with these books in hand they show their Protestant neighbours that the Catholic religion met in England much the same fate as in Japan. We would recommend those friends of ours to furnish themselves with Dr. Jessopp's book. Their neighbours may look at their prints or read the clauses of a persecuting law, and think that perhaps these are libels and those a dead letter; but no one can read a book written, as Dr. Jessopp's is, by a Protestant clergyman from his own point of view, and when he has finished it, continue to deny *the facts* he has hitherto discredited. A Catholic has much to learn from the book, but a Protestant has more, and we hope that every Catholic will arm himself with a copy and try to get it read by the Protestants about him as widely as he can.

We are induced to make a single extract, if it is only to show how far Dr. Jessopp has carried his personal investigations. Nothing that he could do to throw light on his subject has he left undone. His hero, Father Henry Walpole, made the third year of his probation in the Society at Tournai, and Dr. Jessopp is interested in the old College in that town for Walpole's sake. The following is his description of it, and the persecution it relates to does not date back to the days of the English Elizabeth. He describes a spoliation effected by that Revolution which is not yet a century old, and since that description was written, a fresh spoliation is threatened, and a newer persecution proposes to drive the Jesuits from the modern College in which unaided they have eclipsed their secular rivals who are supported by the State and are established in their ancient College. It would do the Belgian Liberals good if they knew what an English Protestant clergyman thinks of their former achievement, and from it they would gather what his feeling would be, and that of many an Englishman with him, at the fresh spoliation which in the name of liberty they design in imitation of the schemes of their French Republican neighbours. "The good people of Tournai," however, cannot have altogether "broken with the priesthood," if they still continue to prefer to send their sons to the Jesuit College, when they might educate them at half the cost at the heavily-subsidized secular school at the other end of the town.

Dr. Jessopp says—

The original College of the Jesuits at Tournai is used at the present day as the *Athénée* or Public School of the town; it has remained unaltered in its main features since its first foundation. One enters by the self-same porter's lodge through which Henry Walpole passed; the old quadrangle is intact; the old refectory, which could easily have accommodated three hundred students, has been divided into three; the old oratory, which continued to be used as an oratory till fifteen years ago, has been converted into a dormitory, though there never have been scholars to fill it; a portion of

the stately cloister still stands; the vaults in which many of the Jesuit Fathers lie buried were only bricked up in 1870; the extensive gardens and grounds, shorn of all their picturesqueness, still grow vegetables for the household; the old kitchen is used to the present day. One passes into the chapel: the venerable altar is as it was, but the glory of the stained glass windows, still faintly remembered by living men, has departed, and the whole place is dreary, desolate and decaying. The good people of Tournai have broken with the priesthood, and are bitter against them. They have made immense exertions, and incurred very considerable expense, in pushing their *Athenée*, and subsidizing it very heavily; but though there be room in the building for at least two hundred boarders—one hundred and twenty are offered a separate room about sixteen feet square—the place languishes dismally, and the school is never half filled with scholars.

How little does persecution and spoliation effect. In this very town of Tournai, at this very day, there stands the modern Jesuit College in the more modern quarter. It has become so much too small for the accommodation of the numbers who apply for admission, that in 1875 arrangements had been made for the erection of extensive new buildings, though in those already constructed there were one hundred and fifty students provided for on the most liberal scale, and presided over by thirty Jesuit Fathers; whilst the charges for each of these students were more than double of those paid at the secular school at the other end of the town (p. 175).

J. M.

- 
3. *Cambria Sacra*; or the History of the early Cambro-British Christians. By the Rev. Louis Nedelec. Burns and Oates, 1879.

Persistent efforts have been made for a few years past by Anglican theorists to extort from the history of the ancient Welsh Church a vindication, or a palliation, of their own attitude of conscious and fixed resistance to Rome. They have set themselves a hopeless task, if they propose to go beyond assertion and assumption, for the proofs from history are grievously against them. Catholics will welcome heartily every book which helps to make better known the early British saints and the work which they did for God. When the question at issue concerns the spirit and the conduct of a whole people in a matter deeply interesting to all and each, the best arguments are not those which scholars find in puzzling over isolated texts. In establishing the Scriptural proof of the Divinity of Jesus Christ it was absolutely unimportant whether in a celebrated controversy a Greek MS., being subjected to microscopic scrutiny, did, or did not, reveal the minute stroke which made all the difference between the abbreviated form of the word signifying God, and a poor little pronoun;<sup>1</sup> for although irrefutable proofs of that central truth may be found in abundance in separate passages of the New Testament, a stronger argument than is contained in any single sentence comes from the grand context of the Gospel narrative. The Catholicity of the first Christians of Wales was never doubtful to any one who formed his judgment from the larger indications of history, but it is fair to hope that increased knowledge of the lives they led will place the fact even beyond the denial of those who feel that, unless they can deny it, they are themselves in a false position.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 16.

In the book to which we now call the attention of our readers, the Reverend author has preferred the simple statement of what was actually said and done to any more direct form of controversy. The conclusion which ought to suggest itself to any unprejudiced mind is that Catholics, and only Catholics, can honestly declare, *Quod illi crediderunt ego credo.*

The first eight chapters describe the working of Welsh Christianity, the remaining nine are devoted to hagiography. The subordination of the British Church to the Holy See, the constant use of Confession and Communion, the practice of praying to the saints and for the dead, the development of monastic life to the great benefit of the country, the frequent occurrence of miracles, are shown in succession. Then follow biographical sketches of some of the principal saints, Dubricius, Teilo, Oudoceus, Cadoc, Iltyd, David, Samson, Paulus Aurelianus, and Gildas the historian.

The author's modest Preface disarms criticism. English is his adopted, not his native language. Therefore he is content to tell his story simply, having no other ambition than to help to restore the pure glories of those early days of faith, and thereby do good service to those in whom he, a Breton by birth, claims the right of a kinsman to take more than ordinary interest.

- 
4. *Pietas Mariana Britannica.* A History of English Devotion to the Most Blessed Virgin Marye, Mother of God. With a Catalogue of Shrines, Sanctuaries, Offerings, Bequests, and other Memorials of the Piety of our Forefathers. By Edmund Waterton, F.S.A., Knight of the Order of Christ, of Rome. London : St. Joseph's Catholic Library, 48, South Street, Grosvenor Square, 1879.

This really magnificent volume has at last issued from the press, and we welcome it with great delight. No doubt, all that the industrious author has been able to collect as to the various forms, in which the universal devotion of our forefathers to the Blessed Mother of God showed itself, can be but a poor representation of what that devotion really was. No doubt the catalogue of nearly three hundred places in the country, in which various devotions to our Lady or various memorials in her honour are known to have existed, cannot represent a tithe or a hundredth part of the shrines which were raised or the holy rites which were practised for that purpose. It is but the gleanings of a field, not the full harvest, that is here represented. Still, it is a great deal in itself. No Catholic will rise from the perusal of these pages without feeling a fresh glow of fervour in his love towards our Lady, an increase of joy at the thought that she was of old so much honoured among us, and a strong desire that her honour may be once more restored in England and advanced a thousand-fold. We are sometimes tempted to a certain amount of self-complacency on this point, as if the English Catholics of the present day had made some improvement in

this respect on the habits of their ancestors. For that matter, we can never believe that the love of our Lady did not burn very brightly indeed in the hearts of the sturdy and enduring Catholics of the days of persecution or proscription, however slender may have been their opportunities of displaying that love outwardly. But it would be very foolish to suppose that because we have the statues of our Lady in our churches, our Months of Mary, our confraternities, and our popular devotions, we are therefore at all near the level of universal devotion which was to be found in the England of the ante-Reformation times. The whole land was full of Mary, whose "Dower" it was commonly called. The whole of life, public and private, was full of her likewise. We are but limping followers of our forefathers, and it may very well be, that, until we limp a little faster than we do, we shall not have any great blessing on the work which is put into our hands, of reclaiming our beloved country to its ancient faith.

The book before us is full of the most valuable suggestions as to devotion in honour of our Lady. We will add, moreover, that there is a solid and genuine character about the older forms of devotion which is very suggestive indeed to those who wish to penetrate themselves through and through with the spirit of the Church. The book is beautifully got up, and should be among the treasures of every family that desires to honour Mary. We are sorry to know that the number of copies which have been printed is somewhat limited.

---

5. *Freedom of Education and Teaching.* By Lucien Henri. Cambridge, 1879.

The first part of this pamphlet is a protest in the author's own name against M. Jules Ferry's Education scheme, the second part is a translation of a letter received by him from the Bishop of Autun. Both are full of generous indignation. The French Minister's retrograde Bill for restoring to full activity a more than usually odious form of despotism, from which Frenchmen, after long-continued efforts had at last nearly shaken themselves free, has received a good deal of unfavourable criticism in England, even from those who ordinarily look with scant approval on the religious communities of the Catholic Church. The proposal to punish men with civil disabilities for the crime of having competed too successfully against the State schools is so audacious in its injustice that it cannot help being condemned by any honest Englishman as soon as he has acquired a competent knowledge of the facts. The attitude taken up by the Minister reminds us very forcibly of the undignified alternative of the schoolmaster who began by fighting with one of his big boys, and then being worsted in the combat, gave orders for the chastisement of the delinquent in regular form. Those who do not wish to speak bitterly of M. Jules Ferry's injustice may commute their censures into a good laugh at his sublime disregard of all conventionalities of justice and decorum.



Some statistics quoted in this pamphlet have been presented in the May number of the MONTH, but they will bear repetition. Facts of this kind are the best answer to M. Ferry's bombast.

The number of students in free colleges is considerably less than the number in State schools. Yet of more than 2,000 exhibitions, which during the past thirty years have been awarded to the successful candidates at the final examinations, 1,547 were obtained by pupils of free schools, and only 494 were gained by those of State schools. This success has been specially evident in the schools of one section of the free institutions. Our worthy *Figaro* tells us that one single college of this section has sent into the military academy of Saint-Cyr 1,284 pupils, 458 to the Ecole Polytechnique, 189 to the Naval Academy, 59 to the Forest Academy, and, lastly, 288 to the Ecole Centrale. The entire contribution from the State to this section of free teachers which has produced such brilliant results was less than 900 francs (about £36).

---

6. *The M'Phersons*; or, Is the Church of Rome making progress in England?  
By T. H. Shaw. Burns and Oates, and R. Washbourne, 1879.

We noticed at the time of its appearance the little controversial story entitled, *Which is it; or War in the Heavens*, intended to be the first in a series of *Tales for the Million*. The second of the series, *The M'Phersons*, just published, is inspired by the same patriotic zeal. Catholics, whose hearts are yearning for the conversion of dear Old England, will be glad to encourage any well-directed efforts to put truer thoughts about the Church of Jesus Christ within the reach of that great "middle class," whose unwillingness to listen to any exposition of doctrine at variance with their ingrained prejudices, and more likely to damage than improve their worldly prospects, has been since the resurrection of the faith and the re-establishment of the Hierarchy the chief obstacle to enlightenment. To the highest and the lowest in the social scale truth finds more ready access than to those who sit down comfortably between the two extremes, who, on the one hand, are not prepared by a refined education to appreciate the logical force and moral beauty of Catholicity, and, on the other hand, have none of the humility which poverty tends to produce.

The more public attention is invited to the statistics of Catholic progress, the more will men, who are accustomed to estimate goodness by practical results, be brought to feel the force of a very substantial fact, which it is useful to their souls that they should thoroughly realize, —the fact that Popery is not only alive, but more than ever *rampant*, certainly unrepressed and to all appearances quite irrepressible, and actually talking loudly of spiritual triumphs in the not far distant future, when the religions of yesterday shall have disappeared for ever. Mr. Shaw's tales will help to disseminate this useful knowledge of an accomplished fact, which may be to many sturdy Protestants as a revelation from Heaven stimulating further inquiry. As a mere matter of private opinion, we should be inclined to exclude for the present from Catholic statistics mere lists of names of converts, under the conviction that we have already "aired" that particular theme quite sufficiently for all good purposes.

7. *Bellevue and its Owner.* By C. Pilley. Washbourne, 1879.

The theme is not new to Catholic story-tellers. A family suffers a sudden reverse of fortune by the death of the father and the dishonesty of his agent. The Christian matron shows herself equal to the occasion, and her children find strength in her example, derive benefit from adversity, and struggle forward into happier times.

---

8. *Record of a Girlhood.* By Frances Ann Kemble. Bentley, 1878.

This pleasant, gossiping book of recollections recalls to life many literary celebrities of a generation which has nearly passed away. "Fanny Kemble" knew them all, and she has refreshed her memory now, in what she calls "the garrulous time of life," by dipping into a large collection of her own letters, written during a period of forty years.

---

9. *The Ruddy Harper*, and other poems. By the Rev. George P. Edwards. Lane, 1878.

The short poem, which from the epithet applied by the Sacred Writer to David in his youth receives the title of the Ruddy Harper, lends its name to a volume of fugitive pieces of which it is the first. Minor minstrelsy is, it must be confessed, for the most part very wearisome to listen to, but this little collection of lyrics contains many good thoughts gracefully expressed.





ST. JOSEPH'S  
CATHOLIC LENDING LIBRARY,

48, South Street, Grosvenor Square.

OPEN DAILY FROM HALF-PAST TEN TO FIVE O'CLOCK.

---

NEW BOOKS FOR JUNE.

*Pietas Mariana Britannica.* By E. Waterton.  
*A Gracious Life* (Mme. Acarie). By E. Bowles.  
*Réminiscences.* Par Mme. Craven.  
*One Generation of a Norfolk House.*  
*The Life of Bishop Fisher.*  
*Harding the Money Spinner.* By Miles G. Keon.  
*Cambria Sacra.*  
*Wœrener's Jeunesse d'Elisabeth d'Angleterre.*  
*The King's Secret.*  
*Poems of the late R. S. Hawker.*  
*Life of St. M. Frances of the Five Wounds.*  
*Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty.*  
*The Manna of the Soul.* By Father Segneri. (Third Volume).  
*Three Catholic Reformers.* By M. H. Allies.  
*The Sermon on the Mount.* By Father Coleridge.  
*Life of Father Benvenuto Bambozzi.*  
*A Benedictine of the Fourteenth Century.*  
*The Curé's Niece.*  
*Le Saint Homme de Tours.*  
*La Médaille Miraculeuse.*  
*Roman Violets.*  
*Life of Sister Jeanne Bénigne Gojos.*  
*Christian Life and Virtues.* Vol. II.  
*La Philothée de St. F. de Sales.* Vie de Mme. de Charmois.  
*Forget-me-nots.* By Miss Kavanagh.  
*History of the Middle Ages* (abridged).  
*The Prisoners of the King.*  
*Ste. Jeanne de Valois et les Annonciades.*  
*Life of B. Hermann Joseph.*  
*Public Life of our Lord.* Vol. IV.  
*Life of Archbishop Dixon.*  
*Life of Henriette d' Osseville.*  
*Life of the Duchess of Doudeauville.*  
*Les Convulsions de Paris.*  
*Records of the English Province S.J.*  
*Vie du R. P. Olivaint, S.J.* Par le Rev. Charles Clair, S.J.  
*Vie de Mme. Duchesne.* Par M. l'Abbé Baunard.  
*The School Manager.* By the Very Rev. J. G. Wenham.  
*Mirror of True Womanhood.* By Rev. Bernard O'Reilly.  
*Life of Mother Margaret Mostyn.*  
*Franciscan Martyrs.*

GRATEFUL.—COMFORTING.

# EPPS'S (BREAKFAST) COCOA.

“By a thorough knowledge of the natural laws which govern the operations of digestion and nutrition, and by a careful application of the fine properties of well-selected Cocoa, Mr. Epps has provided our breakfast tables with a delicately-flavoured beverage which may save us many heavy doctors' bills. It is by the judicious use of such articles of diet that a constitution may be gradually built up until strong enough to resist every tendency to disease. Hundreds of subtle maladies are floating around us ready to attack wherever there is a weak point. We may escape many a fatal shaft by keeping ourselves well fortified with pure blood and a properly nourished frame.”—*The Civil Service Gazette*.

“MANUFACTURE OF COCOA.—We will now give an account of the process adopted by Messrs. James Epps and Co., manufacturers of dietetic articles, at their works in the Euston Road, London.”—See Article in *Cassell's Household Guide*.

MADE SIMPLY WITH BOILING WATER OR MILK.

SOLD ONLY IN PACKETS, LABELLED

**JAMES EPPS & CO., Homœopathic Chemists,  
LONDON.**

Makers of EPPS'S GLYCERINE JUJUBES, for Throat Irritation.



